

were voting for a 10-figure increase that would go to cut taxes for wealthy people and large corporations. But make no mistake—as predictably as night follows day, we now have a renewed call in the House of Representatives for a budget amendment—a constitutional, balanced budget, “stop me before I sin again” amendment. Now that Republicans have exploded the deficit, the absolutely vital public assistance programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are now at risk. If there is a balanced budget amendment, they have said that we have to get to the basic programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid to make up the difference. I think it is unconscionable to give tax breaks to people who are well off and comfortable and then to cut the basics of human existence for many senior citizens in Social Security and Medicare.

The devastating first act of the Republican tax plan and fiscal conservatives, as they define it, has exploded our Nation's deficit and provided enormous benefit to those who, frankly, don't need it. We can't let the second act be a balanced budget constitutional amendment that will end up pillaging the basic programs that help low- and middle-income Americans the most in the name of fiscal responsibility.

#### COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. President, there was a poll in the city of Chicago a few years ago by the Chicago Tribune, and they asked the residents of that city: What is the greatest asset in the city of Chicago? Overwhelmingly, they all said the same thing: Lake Michigan. That is understandable. If you have been to that beautiful city and seen that lakefront and realized the impact it has on the quality of life, it is understandable that Chicagoans would value it the most.

Millions of people visit Lake Michigan each year. They swim, kayak, and boat. They just walk along the beach and have little picnics. It really is a major asset. The lake is the primary source of drinking water for more than 10 million people not just in Illinois but in Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, and many other States. Together, the Great Lakes support a multibillion-dollar fishing industry, dozens of local economies, and thousands of small businesses. However, the Coast Guard reauthorization bill, which could come before the Senate as early as tomorrow, will do irreversible damage to the Great Lakes, and I am urging my colleagues to oppose it.

It is not uncommon in this Chamber for Members from each State to stand up from time to time and tell a story to their colleagues about something in their State of great personal value to them and to plead with their colleagues to understand what this means and to stand by them in protecting a great natural resource or a great natural asset.

The bill itself—the Coast Guard reauthorization—I don't have a problem

with. It does a lot of good things for an important part of our military service. It helps equip the Coast Guard with the tools they are going to need so they can keep us safe and be part of the critical homeland security mission. There is, however, one provision in the bill that should not be there.

This bill was reported by the Commerce Committee. One of the provisions in this bill should never have started in the Commerce Committee; it should be in the Environment Committee. It is known as the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act, or VIDA. This provision in the Coast Guard reauthorization bill will undermine the Clean Water Act just to give a generous deal to one specific industry.

VIDA exempts the shipping industry from being regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Clean Water Act. It places it instead under the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard is a great organization, and there are great men and women serving there. The Coast Guard, however, has no expertise in setting standards for clean water; the Environmental Protection Agency has that responsibility. This bill takes that responsibility away from the EPA.

This bill also preempts the States and their rights to implement their own standards that would meet specific needs and limits the public's ability to seek action in court.

Who opposes this bill? The attorney general of the State of Illinois, as well as the attorneys general from New York, California, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington, so far.

The bill's supporters say all of this is necessary to establish a uniform national standard, but the bill doesn't do that. Instead, it cuts a big Great Lakes-sized doughnut hole out of its own standard and exempts ships operating on the Great Lakes from meeting the same “best available control technology” standard that all other shippers are required to meet. It is a sweetheart deal for shippers on the Great Lakes.

VIDA also makes it almost impossible for anyone to ever require ships operating on the Great Lakes to install new pollution controls in the future. This means these ships would likely never be required to use any available technology to prevent the spread of invasive species like mussels, blood red shrimp, and Asian carp.

I can't tell you how much money we have spent to stop the Asian carp from invading the Great Lakes. We think it is going to destroy the Great Lakes as a marine habitat if we are not careful, and we have stopped them so far. This irresponsible measure as part of the Coast Guard reauthorization goes in exactly the opposite direction. It opens the door for invasive species invading our Great Lakes through ballast water. That is unacceptable.

Chicagoans deserve to know that ships operating on Lake Michigan are

using the best technology available to prevent the discharge of harmful chemicals into their primary drinking water and invasive species, but the bill's exemptions go far beyond the Great Lakes.

Another provision of VIDA would prevent EPA and States from enforcing standards to stop the shipping industry from releasing fluorinated chemicals into the lakes and oceans across the country. Many of my colleagues have become familiar with chemicals like PFAS and PFOA after they contaminated critical groundwater sources in their own States.

As the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I can't tell you how many colleagues from all across the United States have now discovered that these perfluorinated chemicals are a danger to their drinking supply and a public health hazard. They come to me begging for Federal funds to clean up the messes at military bases and airports. Now we are considering a bill on the floor that weakens the standard for release of those chemicals into our water supply. What are we thinking? Is the shipping industry worth that much that we turn our backs on this public health hazard?

I have seen how the military has used these chemicals over the years for legitimate purposes like firefighting. Now we are going to spend millions of dollars cleaning them up, and this Coast Guard bill is going to make it worse. Allowing the commercial shipping industry to freely release these chemicals into bodies of water without proper oversight is downright disgusting.

All of these reasons are why more than 115 environmental organizations have announced their opposition to this Coast Guard bill. It has nothing to do with the Coast Guard—we value them; we treasure them; we want to help them—but to slip this provision in, this environmental rider which endangers the water supply for millions of Americans, is just wrong.

Despite all these objections, Senator MCCONNELL now wants to bring this bill to the floor in a way that will limit debate, doesn't allow for any amendments to change it, and provides no pathway to improve the bill or to delete this terrible provision. This is not how to consider an issue that is so important with so many people concerned about it.

I urge my colleagues, when this measure of the Coast Guard reauthorization comes up for a vote on cloture on concurrence, to vote no.

Today it is the Great Lakes. Tomorrow it is your backyard, it is your water supply that some special interest group will want to contaminate in the name of more profits. We can do better. We owe it to our kids to do better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Arizona.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1551

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today, as I have and will continue to do until we find a resolution to this issue. I rise to advocate for a solution to address the issue of securing our border and protecting those young immigrants impacted by an uncertain future in the DACA Program.

Last month, I offered legislation to extend DACA for 3 years and to provide 3 years of increased funding for border security—this so-called 3-for-3 plan. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues have repeatedly chosen to block this measure from coming to the floor, but the President's decision to send National Guard troops to the border displays a continued interest to secure the border. To take care of that aspect, this bill would provide significant resources to do just that, to help secure the border, at the same time protecting these young immigrants from possible deportation.

I am the first to admit this solution is far from perfect, but it provides a temporary fix for these critical problems and will provide all sides of the debate with just enough of what they want. It is a compromise. It would begin the process of funding the President's plan to improve border security and, as I mentioned, ensure DACA recipients will not lose protections and face possible deportation.

These young immigrants were brought here through no fault of their own. They have waited long enough for these protections. Likewise, border communities, like in my home State of Arizona, have waited long enough for increased security along our southern border.

As I have said before, we in Congress have too regularly confused action with results and have been entirely too comfortable ignoring problems that are just actually tough to solve. We may not be able to deliver a permanent solution to these problems at this time, but we now have an opportunity to offer at least some action on them. There are many people whose lives and well-being depend on our ability to deliver meaningful results.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 300, H.R. 1551. I further ask that the Flake substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally.

The majority whip.

SYRIA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to offer some remarks on

the decision of the President of the United States to order precision missile strikes on three facilities in Syria last Friday night.

This action demonstrates American leadership in the face of gross human rights violations and, as we all recall, President Obama's redline, which was not enforced, which indeed is a provocation in and of itself.

I am glad this President has seen fit now, not just once but on two occasions, to punish the Syrian regime for such gross human rights violations. These actions are consistent with our values and legal authorities provided to the President under the Constitution. They are similar to decisions made by Presidents Clinton and Obama in Kosovo and Libya.

While not unprecedented, clearly what occurred is very serious. So I want to take just a few moments to explain why I think the strikes were justified and were the appropriate course of action taken against the Assad regime.

What we now know is, the Syrian government, on April 7, attacked civilians in the city of Duma, killing at least 70 and injuring 500 more. To carry out the attack, the regime used chlorine and sarin gas against its own people. We know this because credible medical personnel—including the World Health Organization—reported physical symptoms that indicated these substances had been used. People were convulsing in the streets, their nervous systems were attacked, their pupils were constricted, all telltale signs of these chemicals.

When civilians suffer in this way, there is nothing normal or acceptable about it—even in a country grappling with a brutal civil war. That Bashar al-Assad inflicted these crimes on his own people makes them even darker and more insidious.

Chemical weapons have long been the kind of redline in the realm of armed, international conflict. After World War I, the 1925 Geneva Protocol banned chemical and biological weapons because they are different in kind from guns, sabers, and bombs.

One reason they are different is because of the suffering they inflict on their victims. Another reason is because of their indiscriminate nature. Gases, by their very nature, are impossible to control. They spread in the atmosphere. You can't quarantine gas inside of a defined battlefield, which means civilians can't and will not be spared. In other words, there is nothing surgical or targeted about these weapons. The use of them can't be tailored to avoid harming children and innocent bystanders. They are instruments of terror, short and simple, and their brutality and lethality are stunning.

A third reason these weapons are so atrocious is because of the slippery slope they provide. If gas attacks are tolerated in the international community, what comes next—biological, radiological, or nuclear weapons? That is

not an unreasonable question. The free world must therefore stand unified against the use of chemical weapons. The failure to do so sends a signal of idleness or even complicity to the dictators of the world.

The Geneva Protocol that eventually led to the Chemical Weapons Convention has been ratified by more than 190 nations. This means there is a near global consensus that the kinds of gas attacks perpetrated by Bashar al-Assad are completely out of bounds, even in war zones.

As I stand here today, I want to offer my support for both the mission that was carried out and the underlying objective, which was to degrade Syria's capability to research, develop, and deploy chemical weapons—ones that have clearly done tremendous amounts of harm.

The targets of our Syrian missile strikes were a research center and two storage facilities used in the production and testing of chemical and biological weapons. We hope that now that these facilities are destroyed, Assad will be perhaps persuaded not to use chemical weapons once and for all. There is reason to be skeptical, as we know, since he has before. We all remember last year when we struck Syrian airfields after similar provocations. Bashar al-Assad ignored our warning, gassed his own people, and has now paid a higher price. Will it be enough? Who can know, but I hope so. The consequences of his cruel and repressive tactics were swift and circumscribed airstrikes ordered by the President of the United States. They protected against the loss of innocent life and avoided sparking a larger regional conflict.

We are grateful to our allies, Great Britain and France, which played a pivotal role in the mission. We are also grateful to our uniformed military for their meticulous planning, flawless execution, and courageous leadership.

#### TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on another matter that is very much on Americans' minds, today is tax day. This is the day our 2017 tax returns are due, and I know many Texans are breathing a sigh of relief, knowing what lies just around the corner, and that is because today is the last time Americans will file taxes under the old, broken Tax Code that we overhauled last year in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Yesterday, our friend Representative KEVIN BRADY in the House wrote that now we can finally say "Goodbye and good riddance to that outdated monstrosity of a tax code that took [so] much of [Americans'] money, sent [so many American] jobs overseas, and kept our economy so slow, many workers didn't see a pay raise for a decade or more."

It has been estimated that after-tax income in Texas will increase by close to \$2,600 because of the changes that we enacted into law and which were signed by the President. All across the State,