

On Monday evening, the National Foster Youth Institute had a forum in which we were able to hear from many of the youth. They raised several issues. The young adults have already accomplished a lot in their life, and many are here to learn about the Capitol, their Members of Congress, the legislative process, but also to teach us.

Here are several of the issues that the young folks raised on Monday:

One individual raised the challenge of being raised in the system and being separated from his siblings. He said that he had six siblings, and even had a twin. It was very sad and upsetting to him when his twin was sent to one city and he had to live in another city. It took him many months to reestablish a relationship with his siblings.

Another individual told us about her parents having a drug problem. She didn't understand why she was removed and why her parents weren't helped. In fact, she felt as though the court system used her as leverage over her parents in a way, to tell her parents that they should sober up if they wanted to retain custody. She then told us that the result was both of her parents passed away. She believed that they passed away from their addiction, and that one of the things that made their addiction worse was the fact that she had to be removed from the parents.

Another individual raised the issue of sex trafficking. We have been discussing legislation in the House. We have passed several bills related to sex trafficking. But one of the things that many Members of Congress have grown to be aware of over the last few years is that a large percentage of underage girls, and some boys, who get caught up in sex trafficking are actually foster youth that have fallen through the cracks.

Any time a foster youth falls through the cracks, the government is responsible. When we remove children from their parents, we, meaning the government, become the parents and we are responsible for them. So we are working on legislation to improve that.

Another individual raised the issue that she was adopted, but the adoption didn't work out. She asked: Why don't social workers follow up after a child has been adopted, just to make sure that everything is okay? That adoption didn't work out, and she had a lot of challenges afterwards.

Another individual told us, in no uncertain terms, that, although many young people come to the Capitol and volunteer in internships, foster youth would love to be here and participate in internships as well, but when foster youth turn 18 and become an adult, we—essentially meaning the government again—wash our hands of them and put them out on the street. How can a young person volunteer? They need to be paid. She raised the issue that we should have interns at the Capitol, but they should be paid.

Those were very important issues and they all raise areas of policy that need to be addressed.

I am very honored and fortunate to have three outstanding young individuals with me. I want to tell you about them.

Doniesha Thomas is from Los Angeles. She was in foster care for 20 years. She aged out of the system, but during the time she was in foster care, she was moved seven different times.

She grew up in Los Angeles. She was in a foster home with her sister and brother. She was fortunate that her siblings were able to be kept together. She described her experience in the foster home wasn't the best. She said that, sadly, her foster mother was abusive mentally, physically, and emotionally.

She eventually left the home and then had to move from place to place, but she persevered and is currently a college student at Los Angeles Trade Tech. She is majoring in the administration of justice and minoring in paralegal studies. It is her dream to be a probation officer for juveniles. She also hopes to one day open up a group home so that, growing up in the system and knowing what the problems are, she can start a program where she addresses those problems.

The second individual, Leonardo Jimenez, is 21 years old. He is also from Los Angeles. He was recently aged out of foster care. He decided to participate in the program because, as he gets older, he wants to learn to be a part in helping foster youth in his community.

The last individual is Michael Rogalski. He is from Ohio. He was in foster care for 5 years and had 13 different placements, but he is succeeding in Ohio, working in the area of child support.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we remember the foster youth in our country this month.

HONORING DR. TOD BURNETT ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dr. Tod Burnett, who is retiring as president of Saddleback College in Mission Viejo, California.

Since 2008, when Dr. Burnett was named the ninth president of Saddleback, he has transformed the college into one of the top higher education institutions in California and the country.

Over the last 9 years, Dr. Burnett established partnerships with local school districts, supported adult education programs, and pioneered the development of comprehensive support services for veterans, Active-Duty military, and their families.

Prior to his time at Saddleback, Dr. Burnett was appointed to several gov-

ernment positions, serving in the administrations of a U.S. President, a Governor, and mayor. He also served as vice chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the largest higher education system in the Nation.

More importantly, Dr. Burnett's involvement in the community outside of work has left a lasting impression on those who know him. He has mentored veterans, personally funded student trips to Washington, and dedicated resources to various programs throughout the region.

Dr. Burnett's generosity and commitment to his community and career has transformed the lives of countless individuals at Saddleback College and throughout Orange County.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. Burnett for his decades of work and dedication to service of the people of California, and I wish him well during his much-deserved retirement.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to announce that my foster shadow, Shaderra Riddick, who is a Rutgers student studying anthropology, is with me today in the gallery. I am delighted to have her with me, and I offer these remarks on her behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask a simple question to my colleagues here who support President Trump's budget proposal: What kind of America do you envision?

What kind of America do you envision when you support proposed tax plans that line the pockets of Wall Street investors, yet raise taxes for the working men and women struggling to make ends meet.

What kind of America do you envision when you support rewarding corporations that willfully and admittedly evade American tax laws by stashing profits overseas and, even with proposed tax amenities, still punish their rank-and-file employees that can't save because they are paid below a living wage?

What kind of America do you envision when you proudly support the elimination of Federal agencies that protect our workers from discrimination or subject our children to an environment that is unhealthy and harmful to their health?

The President's budget proposal released yesterday is built on heartless cuts to Medicaid; SNAP; Social Security disability insurance benefits; additional income for poor seniors, disabled adults, and children; and public assistance for needy families.

It threatens regular Americans' ability to buy a home and the ability for that home to even be an investment worth the risk.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, this budget is the latest in a series of actions that begs

the question: What kind of America do my Republican colleagues and the President envision for our future? One where the investor class thrives, but the majority of working-class Americans suffer? One where our environment provides temporary profits, but irreparable harm? One where we make a promise to seniors while they work hard to build and sustain our economy, but, upon retirement, snatch away their investments, along with any safety net?

Mr. Speaker, I envision a different America. I envision an America where an honest day's work, no matter where you clock in, deserves a living wage. I envision an America where my granddaughter, Kamryn, will make the same amount as your grandson for the same work. I envision an America where we double down on our investment in public education, and where we double down on our investment in this country's future. I envision a country where commonsense gun legislation limits the opportunity for tragedy to strike in our schools and churches at the hands of hatred and bigotry.

The America I am working toward is an America that celebrates the richness of our diversity, seeks to right past wrongs, an America to be envied.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to concede that we were too divided along this aisle that we can't create new, good-paying jobs, educate our kids, train our workers, create jobs for those workers, and create an America ripe with new opportunity for all.

Mr. Speaker, the America I envision, the America I believe in, the America that we deserve is within our reach. Unfortunately, that America is threatened, ignored, and displaced with this President's budget proposal.

So, again, I ask this question of the President and of my Republican colleagues who will support this callous and shameful budget proposal: What kind of America do you envision, and when will you stand up and fight for the America we all deserve?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and that it is not in order to introduce occupants in the gallery to the House.

BIG BANK BAILOUTS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, in my 29 years in Congress, the issue on which I heard the most from constituents in the shortest time was on the big bank bailouts of several years ago.

When that was before us, I received 6,600 emails in one weekend just in my Washington office from Friday, when the office closed, until Monday, when we opened back up. This, of course, was in addition to the many thousands of phone calls, letters, and emails that

came in during the week before and the week after.

I opposed that big bank bailout, but, of course, extremely big business won again and the Congress voted for the bailout.

Three years ago, in 2014, I wrote the following in a newsletter to my 760,000 constituents:

"A few weeks ago, George Mason University released a report saying that 'since the financial crisis, U.S. banking assets and deposits have continued to consolidate in a handful of large banks.' The five largest banks now hold 44 percent of U.S. banking assets compared to 23.5 percent in early 2000. Liberals in Congress passed the Dodd-Frank law, which I opposed, supposedly to get back at the banks that caused our most recent financial troubles. The George Mason report also said the Dodd-Frank law is 'disproportionately burdensome to small banks' and 'creates a market expectation that designated firms are too big to fail.' Columnist Veronique de Rugy wrote that 'the number of small banks has dropped dramatically over the years,' and this has been 'driven by regulatory burdens that make it hard and expensive for small banks to survive.' I have been told by several east Tennessee bankers that, unfortunately, their fastest-growing departments have been their regulatory compliance sections. The more any business or industry comes under Federal regulation, the more it ends up being dominated by extremely big business."

Now, to update what I wrote in 2014. According to the Congressional Research Service, 1,744 banks have ceased to exist since the passage of Dodd-Frank. Many of those have been forced to merge with a bigger bank because they simply were not able to keep up with all the rules, regulations, and red tape of Dodd-Frank and the resulting compliance costs.

□ 1115

Even worse, 203 small banks have failed—been forced out of business by Big Government—with a resulting huge loss of jobs and lost investment by stockholders. In addition, nationally, 160 credit unions have closed. Either they failed or were forced to consolidate with a bigger credit union. Thus, Dodd-Frank, as most Federal regulatory legislation, ended up helping the big giants and hurting the little guys—the smallest banks and credit unions.

In a study by Hester Peirce and Robert Greene, the authors wrote: "Regulatory compliance can be a particular challenge for small banks with limited compliance expertise. Regulatory expenses absorb a larger percentage of small banks' budgets than of their larger counterparts' budgets. As financial regulation has increased, so has banking concentration. The Dodd-Frank Act, passed in 2010, imposes a new set of regulations that are disproportionately burdensome to small banks. Moreover, by designating the

largest financial institutions as 'systemically important,' Dodd-Frank creates a market expectation that designated firms are too big to fail and generates funding and other competitive advantages for the largest U.S. banks."

Liberals, Madam Speaker, often claim that they are for the little guys, and most Federal laws are well intended. But there is a saying to "beware of the tyranny of good intentions." Every industry that is highly federally regulated almost ends up in the hands of a few big giants.

Federal regulators should start trying to help out the smallest business instead of always ending up helping extremely big business. That is something that happens in almost every business and industry in this country, and it needs to be reversed.

REMEMBERING RICHARD WILBUR COLLINS III

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Speaker, Richard Wilbur Collins III was ready to graduate from Bowie State University yesterday. He just finished Army ROTC, was airborne qualified, and was just commissioned a second lieutenant in the United States Army's intelligence branch. His father is a Navy veteran, and Richard wanted to follow in his footsteps and commit his life to serving our Nation. He was ambitious and driven. His calling was to protect our country and to do what is right and just.

He loved soccer and lacrosse. He was the top runner in his ROTC unit. His Facebook page was filled with selfies with his friends. He was active in his church. His friends and family said that he had a loving and giving heart and would go out of his way to try and help others.

On Saturday morning, while waiting for an Uber ride with two friends at the University of Maryland, he was approached by another student who demanded that he "Step left. Step left if you know what is best for you." Richard simply replied, "no." The other student stabbed him in the chest and fled. Richard died in the hospital. His bright future was stolen. His parents were robbed of their son. Our hearts are broken.

This tragedy exposes a dangerous rising tide. This incident was not some random act of violence. It was a heinous, despicable, and unprovoked crime of hate.

Richard Collins' murderer—who was from a middle class family, who hung out at the student union and library—was a member of a racist neo-Nazi group called Alt-Reich Nation. He was not some outsider. He was a home-grown terrorist who was radicalized on the university campus.

What is most troubling is this isn't the first incident of hate at the University of Maryland. This academic year