also promised that Mexico would pay for it. Where is Mexico? It has said 12 times that it is not paying for it. That is not the promise he made.

Finally, on the wall, it sends a terrible symbol to the world about the United States—about who we are, what kind of country we are. Since the 1880s, a beautiful statue in the harbor of the city in which I live has been the symbol of America to the world—that great torch that symbolizes what a noble land we are. Can you imagine, if in future decades, that symbol were to be replaced with a big, foreboding wall? That is not who America is, was, or, hopefully, will be.

As I mentioned, we are for sensible border security, and there are many more effective ways of securing the border than by building a wall. A wall can be scaled over. I am sure that those who love the wall have heard of ladders. A wall can be tunneled under. I am sure that those who support the wall have heard of shovels. It is a medieval solution for a modern problem—a ''Game of Thrones'' idea for a world that is a lot closer to ''Star Wars.'' The thing is that we have new, modern solutions that use our best technology. We discussed some of them at the White House last night.

Drones. These drones can spot the difference between a deer and a human being crossing the border. We have great sensory equipment, and our military has specialized in this kind of stuff. A lot of it is made in Syracuse, NY, I am proud to say. We can rebuild roads along the border. Talk to the people in the Border Patrol, and they will say that a lot of places do not have roads so that, if they see someone crossing the border, they cannot get to them. Of course, there is the bipartisan McCaul-Thompson bill in the House—MCCAUL, a Republican, and THOMPSON, a Democrat—that has broad, bipartisan support and that sets certain standards. Every one of these ideas would provide better, more effective border security than would a medieval wall.

There is still much to be done. We have to put meat on the bones of the agreement, and the details will matter, but it was a very, very positive step for the President to commit to DACA protections without insisting on the inclusion of or even a debate about the border wall.

EQUIFAX DATA BREACH

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the Equifax data breach, what has transpired over the past several months is one of the most egregious examples of corporate malfeasance since Enron. Equifax has exposed the most sensitive personal information of over half of the citizens of the United States—names, addresses, Social Security numbers, driver's licenses, and, in some cases, even their credit histories. Clearly, there were inadequate data security standards at Equifax, which is deeply troubling on a number of levels.

When you are a credit agency like Equifax, you have two principal jobs: calculating and reporting accurate credit scores and protecting the sensitive information of individuals that is funneled through that process. Stunningly and epically, Equifax failed to perform one of its two essential duties as a company—protecting the sensitive information of the people in its files. That is unacceptable, and there is no other word for it.

Even following the failure by Equifax—this huge, massive failure—the company and its leadership failed to effectively communicate this breach to the public and, in the aftermath of the announcement, failed to address public concern. The company knew about the breach and did not notify consumers that their information had been compromised for far too long a period. Because Equifax waited so long to report the breach, consumers were put behind the eight ball. Their information was potentially compromised without their knowledge, and they had no ability to protect themselves. Meanwhile, hackers could attempt to take out loans in their names and potentially use the information for identity fraud or they could perpetrate a number of fraudulent schemes with the sensitive information that these horrible hackers had obtained.

Once the breach was eventually announced, consumers found themselves being forced to provide sensitive information to Equifax in order to verify whether they were impacted by the breach. In order to sign up for the company's credit monitoring services, customers were forced to agree to terms prohibiting their ability to bring a legal claim against Equifax. Isn't that disgusting?

Equifax creates the problem and then says: Customer, if you want to solve it, you have to give up your rights.

That is outrageous.

Equifax is saying: We royally screwed up, but trust us. We will not screw up again, but if we do screw up, you cannot sue us.

To make matters worse, in the weeks leading up to the announcement of its breach, while customers were in the dark, several executives at Equifax sold off their stock in the company. They claim that they had no knowledge of the breach. If they did, it would be one of the most brazen and shameful attempts of insider trading that I can recall.

We need to get to the bottom of this—the very bottom, the murky bottom, the dirty bottom. The Senate must hold hearings on the Equifax breach during which these executives will be called to account. There is no question about that. Beyond that, five things need to happen in the near future. I would like to see them in the next week.

First, Equifax must commit proactively to reach out to all impacted individuals and notify them that their personal, identifiable information may have been compromised and, if known, inform them of exactly what information has been released.

Second, provide credit monitoring and ID theft protection services to all impacted individuals for no less than 10 years. If an individual chooses not to use the credit monitoring service offered by Equifax because they naturally don't trust them, then Equifax should reimburse that individual for the costs of the alternative credit monitoring service they sign up for.

Third, offer any impacted individual the ability to freeze their credit at any point for up to 10 years.

Fourth, remove arbitration provisions from any agreement or terms of use for products, services, or disclosures offered by Equifax. This means that Equifax will proactively come into compliance with the CFPB's forced arbitration rule, and there will be no question that an individual will not have all legal rights at their disposal.

Fifth, Equifax must agree to testify before the Senate, the FTC, and the SEC, cooperate with any investigation, and comply with any fines, penalties, or new standards that are recommended at the conclusion of these investigations.

If Equifax does not agree to these five things in 1 week's time, the CEO of the company and the entire board should step down. These five steps are common sense. They are the baseline of decency. If Equifax can't commit to them, their leadership is not up to the job, and the entire leadership must be replaced.

Let me tell my colleagues, if Joe Public—if the average citizen did anything close to what the corporate leaders of Equifax did that led to this data breach and the awful response to it, that average citizen would be fired immediately. To give Equifax a week to implement these things is overly generous to people who did horrible stuff and then, after it happened, did nothing—virtually nothing—that showed they had remorse.

It is only right that the CEO and board step down if they can't reach this modicum of corporate decency by next week.

TAX REFORM

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Mr. President—a lot to say this morning—a word on taxes. Last night at the White House, President Trump said he didn't want his tax plan to benefit the very wealthy. That is a good thing. We Democrats agree. Forty-five of the forty-eight of us signed a letter that no tax breaks should go to the top 1 percent. They are doing great. God bless them. I am glad they are doing well. They don't need a tax break. Middle-class people do.

But the devil, when the President says that, is always in the details, and we haven't seen any details. We haven't seen anything resembling a plan yet. We hear it is being written in a back room by the so-called Big 6—all Republican—but I haven't seen it, Ranking Member WYDEN hasn't seen it, and no Democrat in the Senate has seen it.

I can tell you one thing: If the President's tax plan repeals or rolls back the estate tax, it will be clear that a lot of this plan benefits the very rich, contrary to all of his words.

I would remind everyone that only 5,200 of the over 2.7 million estates in this country will pay any taxes this year. The estate tax only kicks in when couples with estates of nearly $11 million transfer their wealth. Go to North Dakota—and I know the Acting President pro tempore has nice family farms out there—and ask how many have an estate worth $11 million, and if they do, I am willing to exempt from the estate tax a family farm that is over that. But almost no one does.

A study by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities showed that of the 5,200 estates—here we have 2.7 million estates. Only 5,200 qualify for the estate tax because they are worth $11 million, and of those, 50 are small farms or businesses—50. Let's exempt those 50. Let's make all of these other guys pay. We need the money. They are rich. God bless them.

So when President Trump says the estate tax is a burden on the family farmer, I honestly don't know what he is talking about. There may be a few. They may make a lot of noise. God bless them. That is their right as Americans. There are very, very few. That is not what the facts say.

Let me show my colleagues the next chart. Of 2.7 million taxable estates, just 50 are farms and small businesses that would benefit from the repeal of the estate tax—2.7 million; 50.

There was an amazing moment last night at the meeting we held at the White House when the estate tax came up, and a few of the President's advisers said: Oh, no one pays the estate tax. There have even been news reports that Gary Cohn has told Members of Congress that ''only morons pay the estate tax.'' What they mean, of course, is that rich people—people rich enough to be levied estate taxes—can find ways around paying them; they can afford all of those lawyers and estate planners.

Well, first, they are wrong. Repealing the estate tax would add $269 billion to the deficit over 10 years—$269 billion. So there are a lot of people paying the estate tax. Maybe they are morons, as Gary Cohn once called them, maybe they are not, but there is a lot of money out there that comes in from these very wealthy with the estate tax.

Second, Mr. Cohn and the others who say this bring up an important point. The right thing to do is not repeal the estate tax but close the loopholes. If you have an estate worth that much, you should be paying the estate tax, not finding clever ways to avoid your tax obligation. Again, if you are rich, if you have a big estate, God bless you. That is the American way. But pay your fair share. Pay your fair share.

Democrats want to participate in reforming our Tax Code. There are lots of good things we can agree on—closing loopholes like this one, cutting taxes for the middle class, helping small businesses, bringing offshore deferred income back into the United States.

We have laid out three principles: no reconciliation—that means do it together, not how they did healthcare, which didn't end up with a great result; second, no tax cuts for the top 1 percent, who are doing just fine, God bless them; third, fiscal responsibility—we should not increase the deficit as we cut taxes, particularly now that we are going to have to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to help the beleaguered States of Texas and Florida.

Some Republicans have characterized those three principles as lines in the sand that show that Democrats aren't serious about tax reform. So I would ask my Republican colleagues, which of the three do you not agree with? Do you think we should cut taxes on the top 1 percent? Do you think we should create deficits by cutting taxes on the wealthy? Do you think you should just go at this alone? If you agree with those, fine. Say so. Don't say that these are lines in the sand. We are offering some policy guidance that has virtually unanimous support in our caucus.

By the way, these three principles guided the 1986 tax reform, which was the most successful tax reform we have had in decades.

It seems to me it is not Democrats who would move the goalpost on tax reform but some Republicans who no longer want to play by the same rules.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to my dear friend, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who is doing a great job getting this bill through.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2810, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain/Reed modified amendment No. 1003, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for MCCAIN) amendment No. 545 (to amendment No. 1003), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend from New York. I thank him for the cooperation we have gotten in the consideration of this important legislation.

I would just ask the Democratic leader, is it reasonable to assume that we could finish this up today or set a time for it on Monday?

Mr. SCHUMER. Absolutely.

Mr. McCAIN. Good. I hope we can do that.

I again thank the leader from New York, who has been very cooperative to me and to the Senator from Rhode Island as we have moved forward with this legislation. I thank him.

TRAINING ACCIDENT AT CAMP PENDLETON

Mr. President, I wish to begin by offering my thoughts and prayers to the marines who were injured yesterday when their amphibious assault vehicle caught fire during a training exercise at Camp Pendleton in California. With 15 marines hospitalized and 5 in critical condition, I join all of my colleagues in hoping for a full and speedy recovery for each of these brave young servicemembers.

Last night, unfortunately, the majority leader was required to file cloture on the National Defense Authorization Act for 2018. We have gotten a lot done in the short time this legislation has been on the floor. I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say that it is my hope that we will be able to do more.

I thank my friend from Rhode Island. I thank Members who have been very helpful and cooperative in this effort, as we have considered a 27-to-0 vote through the committee. It passed unanimously. We have engaged in spirited, thoughtful debate, and we have ultimately adopted 277 amendments from both Republicans and Democrats.

I sound like a broken record, but this is the way the Senate should conduct business. The authorizing committee reports out legislation that has been examined with hearings and debate and amendments, and it appears on the floor, and we have additional debates and amendments, and people can vote yes or no, but they are informed.

It is a violation of our oath of office when we are told that one-fifth of the gross national product—i.e. healthcare—is going to be decided by a ''skinny repeal'' that none of us had seen until an hour or two before. That is not the way the Senate should do business.

We are not perfect. We are going to have to invoke cloture on this bill. We are not going to have some debate and votes on some very important—at least four—issues. But while we have been on this bill, we have adopted 277 amendments. We had hours and hours of hearings. We had a week of putting this bill