I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the revisions be printed in the RECORD.

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

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

[Pursuant to section 111 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974]

$s in millions	2014	2014–18	2014–23
Current Budgetary Aggregates:*			
Spending:			
Budget Authority	2,928,080	n/a	n/a
Outlays	2,939,218	n/a	n/a
Revenue	2,311,031	13,699,529	31,095,846
Adjustments Made Pursuant to section 114(d) of the Bipartisan Budget Act: **			
Spending:			
Budget Authority	9,875	n/a	n/a
Outlays	9,875	n/a	n/a
Revenue	1,632	15,668	8,469
Revised Budgetary Aggregates:			
Spending:			
Budget Authority	2,937,955	n/a	n/a
Outlays	2,949,093	n/a	n/a
Revenue	2,312,663	13,715,197	31,104,315

n/a = Not applicable. Appropriations for fiscal years 2015–2023 will be determined by future sessions of Congress and enforced through future Congressional budget resolutions.

*The budgetary aggregates were previously adjusted on January 30, 2014, for H.R. 2642, the Agriculture Act of 2014.

** Adjustments made pursuant to section 114(d) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which incorporates by reference section 302 of S. Con. Res. 8, as passed by the Senate. Section 302(c) establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for Unemployment Relief.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

[Pursuant to section 111 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 and section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974]

$s in millions	Committee on Finance		
	Current allocation	Adjustments*	Revised allocation
Fiscal Year 2014:			
Budget Authority	1,311,988	9,875	1,321,863
Outlays	1,304,815	9,875	1,314,690
Fiscal Years 2014–2018:			
Budget Authority	7,664,235	9,875	7,674,110
Outlays	7,646,654	9,245	7,655,899
Fiscal Years 2014–2023:			
Budget Authority	19,084,627	9,875	19,094,502
Outlays	19,067,886	8,425	19,076,311

*Adjustments made pursuant to section 114(d) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which incorporates by reference section 302 of S. Con. Res. 8, as passed by the Senate. Section 302(c) establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for Unemployment Relief.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR OBJECTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the nomination of Katherine M. O'Regan to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Every year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development provides billions of dollars to public housing authorities but provides little oversight for how the money is spent. Many housing authority directors are more concerned with padding their own nests instead of providing safe, affordable housing for people in need. One way to change this is to make detailed spending information available to the general public.

I will object to Ms. O'Regan's nomination because I have not yet received a response to my February 14, 2014 letter to HUD Secretary Shaun Donovan regarding HUD's effort to collect Public Housing Authority salary and compensation data for calendar year 2013. Specifically, I asked when the data would be available to the general public on the HUD website and whether it would be available in a searchable, standard electronic format.

This is the second time HUD has requested salary and compensation data from the 3100 housing authorities across the United States. HUD first requested data for the top five wage earners in August 2011. At that time, I requested that this data be made available to the general public. HUD stated in a December 2011 letter:

> This information will be posted on a HUD website, consistent with applicable law. We are now in the process of collecting this information for the first time, and expect that it will be posted during the first quarter of the year.

Despite HUD's pledge, the full set of data has never been posted on the Department website. Instead, it only posted three pages of aggregate data in June 2012, and HUD didn't provide the full set of data to my office until May 2013, nearly 2 years after the data collection process was initiated.

HUD is aware of the impact this data can have when made available to the public. Shortly after the compensation information was requested in 2011, Congress imposed a 1 year salary cap for all housing authority executives. Housing authorities are now using Federal funding not covered by the salary cap to continue paying large salaries and compensation packages. The compensation data currently being collected would shed light on this practice and should be posted on the HUD website as soon as possible.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GME SUPPORT REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise on behalf of my colleagues, Senators HARKIN, ALEXANDER, CASEY and ISAKSON to submit the following statement for the RECORD.

On October 30, 2013, the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee unanimously reported the Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2013, S. 1557, out of Committee. On November 12, 2013, the Senate passed S. 1557 by unanimous consent.

This legislation is the product of years of bipartisan negotiation, a process which resulted in broad Senate support for the Act. The list of original Senate cosponsors for S. 1557 demonstrates this point. This list includes Senators CASEY, ISAKSON, HARKIN, ALEXANDER, BLUMENTHAL, BLUNT, BROWN, KIRK, MURPHY, REED, ROBERTS, WARREN, and WHITEHOUSE.

Prior to the enactment of the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education, CHGME, Payment Program, there was significant disparity in federal graduate medical education, GME, support between adult teaching hospitals and children's teaching hospitals. In 1998, children's hospitals received less than 0.5 percent of the level of federal GME support that adult teaching hospitals received. In the 2001 final rule for the CHGME Payment Program, the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, wrote, ''The intent of the CHGME Act is to create parity in GME payments among all hospitals providing GME. It is clear that primarily two factors cause this disparity in children's hospitals: (1) low Medicare utilization; and (2) Prospective Payment System (PPS)-exempt status.''

The CHGME Payment Program has made considerable progress in achieving parity in GME payments, increasing the number of pediatric training positions at participating children's hospitals. However, a small number of freestanding children's teaching hospitals remain ineligible for the program. In 2003, Senate Committee on Appropriations noted the following:

> It has come to the Committee's attention that a limited number of freestanding perinatal hospitals and children's psychiatric hospitals have been excluded from participation in this program despite the fact that these teaching institutions are not eligible for Graduate Medical Education funding under Medicare. The Committee expects [the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)] to explore the appropriateness of including these hospitals in the Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education Program and to offer recommendations that might allow for their inclusion.

Senate Report 108–81.

HRSA responded in a 2004 report to Congress which concluded that addressing this eligibility issue would require Congress to amend the statue governing the CHGME Payment Program. S. 1557 addresses this long-standing issue. The reauthorization legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, to make available up to 25 percent of CHGME appropriations that exceed $245 million for ''qualified hospitals'' that: (1) have a Medicare payment agreement and are excluded from Medicare inpatient hospital prospective payment system; (2) have inpatients that are predominantly individuals under 18 years of age; (3) have an approved medical residency training program; and (4) are not otherwise eligible to receive payments from the CHGME Payment Program or the Medicare program. The total amount the Secretary can make available for these purposes in any fiscal year is limited to $7 million, thus ensuring that adequate resources remain available for the children's hospitals that currently participate in the program.

The Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act provides the Secretary with the necessary authority to address the disparity in GME payment facing certain children's teaching hospitals. These changes are in keeping with the intent of the CHGME Payment Program. As such, these hospitals should have the opportunity to apply for support through the CHGME Payment Program in order to sustain and build their teaching programs, and ultimately increase the supply of much-needed pediatricians and pediatric specialists. We urge the Secretary to weigh these benefits in using the new authority under S. 1557 should funding be available.

HIGH-FREQUENCY TRADING

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, after the financial crisis in 2008, its root causes and the resulting taxpayer-funded bailout; increasingly opaque trading activities that now dominate all stock-trading volume in the U.S.; a string of high-profile convictions of hedge-fund managers and equity analysts; and global settlements with investment banks involving every assortment of ''whale'' and dodgy tax-avoidance scheme, many Americans are now of the view that Wall Street is no longer a vehicle for the creation of investment capital or a reliable engine of entrepreneurialism and economic growth that it has become the province of high-frequency and automated traders. As billionaire investor and long-time HFT critic Mark Cuban admonished a few years ago, it has become a platform to be exploited by every technological and intellectual means possible by whoever can afford them.

At least that is the perception.

It is exactly that perception that has fueled major public concern about revelations contained in Michael Lewis' new book, ''Flash Boys: A Wall Street Revolt''. Lewis's book tells the story of the computer-driven world of high-frequency trading, HFT, co-location and customized data. Indeed, Lewis' narrative appears to have struck a raw nerve among consumers, by confirming a latent belief and skepticism that Wall Street is indeed an insider's game and that the public's best interests are, at most, an afterthought.

If true, Lewis' claim that the market is rigged through variations of HFT could potentially affect everyone from institutional investors to any individual who pays into a pension or mutual fund.

On HFT, one big issue is: how fair is it for certain firms to line their trading systems up with data centers used by exchanges to let them shave-off millionths of a second from every transaction, front-run the market, drive-up prices and profit accordingly, at the expense of average investors who do not enjoy that same capability. Another is: to what extent does HFT and so-called quick-draw trading expose the market to undue risk-taking and potential instability like the 2010 ''flash crash'', in which the Dow Jones dropped 9% in 20 minutes, temporarily erasing $1 trillion in market value?

These are questions that must be taken seriously by policymakers; regulators; and, where warranted, law enforcement officials. Indeed, the Commodities Futures Trading Commission, CFTC, is rightly examining arrangements between HFT firms and exchanges to determine whether insiders are receiving competitive perks, such as reduced rates, that could harm smaller investors. The Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, is similarly looking into potentially improper relationships between exchanges and HFT firms. New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman has labeled certain pernicious HFT practices as ''Insider Trading 2.0'' and launched investigations into practices such as co-location, which permits trading firms to be geographically advantaged over competitors, and other arrangements that permit early access to market-moving information. Just yesterday, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, disclosed that it was also looking into related matters.

Congress, as well as regulators at the SEC and CFTC should fully investigate these issues and pursue proposals that can minimize systemic risk and bolster trust in our markets. But we cannot ignore the inherent limitations that exist in regulating an issue as complex as HFT. The technology and resources readily available to trading firms easily dwarf those available to our government's primary regulators. High-frequency traders have huge incentives to gain even the slightest edge through speed and technology because the payoffs can be exorbitant. For example, a company called Spread Networks reportedly spent $300 million to lay a fiber-optic cable between Chicago and New Jersey to increase the time it took for information to make it from the futures market to the exchanges by 3 milliseconds. That amount nearly matches the entire operating budget of the CFTC for 2013. Policymakers, therefore, face an uphill battle in which regulatory fixes quickly become obsolete as the trading firms' approaches and algorithms adapt almost as rapidly as information travels on their fiber-optic cables.

Against this backdrop, industry must see for itself an opportunity to self-regulate. Rather than hide behind self-serving, arcane arguments that support a status quo that allows for front-running and other unethical trading practices, industry must gather-around strong self-imposed, market-based solutions to the uncertainty and potential harm created by HFT that ensure fundamental fairness and transparency in markets that are technologically evolving at break-neck speed. Indeed, industry can either sit back and wait for regulators or Congress to address these issues with a possibly detrimental outcome for all concerned, or it can be proactive in developing meaningful approaches that not only address the instant problem but also help restore much-needed, long-overdue confidence in the integrity of the financial markets.

Some leaders in industry have recently expressed support for reforms aimed at minimizing unfairness that stems from the ''fragmentation and complexity'' of trading. But more needs to be done: key exchanges, trading firms, investors, banks, and self-regulatory bodies such as the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, FINRA, should explore potential solutions that would ensure technology is employed in a way that encourages competition and innovation, while also increasing the transparency and integrity of the markets.

Congress should keep a watchful eye on developments in this field—I certainly will. Federal regulators and law enforcement should continue to hold accountable those actors and institutions that cross the line into illegality, market-manipulation, and acting on non-public information. Whatever policy solutions are pursued, they must both enhance the functionality of the market and restore public trust and confidence in Wall Street. Industry, specifically traders and exchanges, must focus on cooperation instead of clamoring for speed in a race to the bottom, which would only leave investors in the dust and force consumers to shoulder the burden of another financial crisis.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS VISIT

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the outstanding military service of a group of incredible Coloradans. At critical times in our Nation's history, these veterans each played a role in defending the world from tyranny, truly earning their reputation as guardians of peace and democracy through their service and sacrifice. Now, thanks to Honor Flight, these combat veterans came to Washington, DC to visit the national memorials built to honor those who served and those who fell. They have also come to share their experiences with later generations and to pay tribute to those who gave their lives. I am proud to welcome them here, and I join with all Coloradans in thanking them for all they have done for us.

I also want to thank the volunteers from Honor Flight of Northern Colorado who made this trip possible. These volunteers are great Coloradans in their own right, and their mission to bring our veterans to Washington, DC, is truly commendable.

I wish to publicly recognize the veterans who visited our Nation's capital, many seeing for the first time the memorials built as a tribute to their selfless service. Today, I honor these Colorado veterans on their visit to Washington, DC, and I join them in paying tribute to those who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of liberty.

Veterans from World War II include: Donald Benson, Joe Blossom, Hobert Bodkins, Robert Bueker, George Carlson, Wayne Clausen, Maurice Dragoo, Homer Dye, Karl Easterly, George Flaig, Stuart Gordon, Dale Gruber, Frank Gunter, Vern Hammond, Robert Henderson, Otto Hindman, Lawrence Jackson, John Jobson, Elvin Kahl, Doward Kilmer, Thomas Kokjer, Edward Kooper, Raymond Kusmirek, Ralph Leckler, George Lichter, Lyle Lukas, Alfred Marez, Richard