

trying to deal with immigration, the labor issue might be a constraining factor in the ultimate growth of this economy, and we need to deal with that. For different reasons, both sides believe we need to be investing in infrastructure. I will remind my colleagues in this body that it was just in 2011 when this government threw \$1 trillion into our economy. I would debate the benefit of that particular investment because it was not thrown at those stimulative issues that would grow the economy.

Today, America deals with a new world. The world situation has never been more dangerous. The best thing we can do for our military and for our people is to get this economy moving again and create a level playing field around the world to help our trade situation. That is what the President is trying to do right now—to create a more level playing field so as to grow our economy, fix our budget process, and deal with the spending issues that we have here at home.

I am excited to be a part of the Joint Select Committee on Budget Process Reform, which is charged with changing the way we fund the Federal Government every year. I am hopeful that will lead to a new budget process that will allow us to avoid the continuing resolutions and the omnibuses by which five or six people get in a room and decide how to spend \$1 trillion. The tax changes alone will not dig us out of this debt crisis. We knew that this was the first step in getting it going, and I am delighted with the impact that it is having on our economy today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECESS

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 5:30 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:21 p.m., recessed until 5:33 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. RUBIO).

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I am here to give some brief remarks about what we are on right now, which is a Congressional Review Act vehicle to reconsider agency guidance. There is nothing that sounds more arcane and wonky than that.

The issue at hand has to do with disparate treatment of people when they go in to get a car. There is plenty of evidence that Black and Brown people are taken advantage of and treated more poorly in the credit context than White people. So the CFPB went to collect data and to require that people be treated fairly.

I will be voting against this CRA vehicle, but I actually think there is a bigger, broader, more concerning issue. I am going to try to work with the Parliamentarian's office and with the leadership of both parties to try to address it. Although it is arcane, it is very worrisome for the Senate itself.

The Congressional Review Act passed in 1996. The idea was straightforward: All rules have to have some authority beyond the desire for the agency to want to promulgate rules. It is subject to review by the Congress. In other words, if you don't like what an agency is doing, now there is a pathway called privileged, which allows the Congress to go ahead and overturn that rule. In the Senate, it is especially important because it is not subject to a 60-vote threshold. This is a big deal. This allows Congress to say any time there is a rule made: We are going to overturn it with a bare majority threshold. That was the will of the Congress, and that is Federal law.

Here is how the statute works. The rule gets submitted to GAO and Congress, and then a clock starts and a bunch of statutory triggers go. I dug into this over the last 10 weeks. Suffice it to say it is very complicated. There is a strict timeline, and there are 60 legislative days to take action. And because we are the legislative branch of the Federal Government, legislative days are not actual days; it ends up taking four times that long.

The important part is that there is a process that is prescribed for that, and there is a timeframe that is prescribed for that. That is the authority the Congress gave itself in 1996. That authority is very clear about two things:

First, it is meant to apply to rules, which are binding, and it is meant to have legal force. The CRA gives the Congress a way to weigh in when an agency's interpretation of the law conflicts with the legislative intentions.

Second, it only applies to rules that were recently promulgated. In other words, they specifically envisioned that a clock would run. The rule gets submitted to Congress, the clock runs, and if the Congress likes the rule or if there is not sufficient will to overturn the rule, then the rule stands. If the Congress doesn't like the rule, then a Member can introduce a CRA resolution of disapproval, and we act on it.

This is why what is happening right now is totally nuts. What is happening right now is not what we have normally done with CRAs. What is happening right now is that we are submitting agency guidance—not a rule but agency guidance—which has no legal force, to the same procedures as the

rules under the Congressional Review Act. The guidance in question is implementing guidance for a statute that is 50 years old. The guidance came out 5 years ago. The law that it is implementing is 50 years old. It is a piece of guidance. It is literally interpretation of an existing law for the public. And now we are going to overturn the interpretation of an existing law from an executive agency. We are not overturning a rulemaking.

When you go through the rulemaking process in the executive branch, it takes anywhere from 12 to 36 months. There is a rigorous process. It is sort of quasi-judicial, and you have to really check all the boxes and do it right. Otherwise, you get sued under the Administrative Procedure Act. None of that happened. This was just guidance.

So now, if the Parliamentarian and the GAO and everyone else decides that the CRA applies to guidance, then the time limits on CRA don't matter at all, and the interpretation of this statute is rendered absurd.

I will point out that this is not the most well-crafted Federal law on the books. It is very difficult to interpret this Federal law, so I sympathize with the Parliamentarian and GAO and the leadership of both parties, who are trying to make sense of a statute that is unclear in some places. But when a statute is unclear, you are supposed to interpret the statute in a way that the statute functions. Right now, what we are doing is we are rendering the statute essentially absurd because if it is a rule, you have a strict time limit. If it is guidance—and I am not sure, if it is guidance, why that wouldn't also apply to an agency circular or an executive memorandum for the Under Secretary. All of this could be subject to tens of thousands of pieces of guidance and rules and views, and whatever is considered policymaking could be subjected to a Congressional Review Act action. I think that is completely bananas.

We are going down a path where Congress can take an administrative action that has been done in the last 22 years and subject it to the CRA, and you will not need 60 votes. This is bad for our institution. I can't stress that enough. I understand that this is not the kind of thing that people across the country are going to be deeply passionate about and march on the streets about and be motivated to vote on, but we are in the Senate, and we have an obligation to safeguard the way this institution operates.

I am deeply afraid that if we subject every piece of administration guidance—and remember, the door swings both ways in Washington. We will have a Democratic Senate. Who knows when, but we will have a Democratic Senate and we will have a Democratic House, and we can scour everything that every Republican administration has done since 1996 pursuant to any law made at any time in our American history and subject it to a majority vote.

I think the last thing this institution needs is a new opportunity to go down new rabbit holes on partisan issues and a new opportunity to fight on small things and not deal with the biggest challenges of our time.

I am going to oppose this on the merits, but I am more worried about what we are doing to our institution. Right now, the Senate is not functioning at a high level. We have not had any open amendment process except vote-arama, which I think 100 Senators would agree is a useless process. So the regular order, which was called for by the then-minority leader when he was criticizing Majority Leader Reid, is nowhere to be found. I am not blaming him. I am not blaming anyone in particular. But I am saying that when there is an opportunity to at least prevent this institution from falling further, we should take that opportunity.

I understand we are not going to be able to intervene in this moment and stop this CRA, but let the record reflect that I do not accept that a precedent is being set. This has not been refereed yet. We have not fully had a conversation with the Parliamentarian and GAO about what exactly CRA is supposed to mean and how it is supposed to operate. If it is supposed to operate in an absurd way, I think we have a lot of work to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

TAX REFORM

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, first of all, happy tax day—three words that probably don't usually go together. I will share that anyway because the reason I am up here is that for the first time in more than three decades, Congress overhauled our Tax Code, and that is what distinguishes this tax day from the ones that came before it. This is the last time Nevadans will file their taxes under the broken system of the past.

You don't have to look too far to see the positive impacts of our new tax laws. They are already having an impact on the people of my home State of Nevada. Nevadans and Americans throughout the country have already benefited from keeping more of their hard-earned money. In fact, more than 1 million Nevadans saw their paychecks get bigger last month because we doubled the standard deduction and we doubled the child tax credit. Taxpayers in every income category received a tax cut under this bill.

Furthermore, since President Trump signed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act into law just a few months ago, more than 500 companies throughout the country have committed to giving their workers bonuses, pay raises, and enhanced benefits as a direct result of tax reform. Let me share a few of those in my home State. About 11,000 Nevadans got a raise. Roughly 13,000 Nevadans received special bonuses of up to \$2,000. Up to 25,000 Nevadans may benefit from college tuition assistance, increased

pension funding, expanded maternity and paternal leave, and more paid holidays. More than 10,000 jobs are expected to be created in Southern Nevada alone.

So it is no surprise that Nevada was recently ranked second among States when it comes to middle-income families who benefit the most from tax reform.

Let me give you a few examples of how this new law is impacting Nevadans. South Point Hotel Casino and Spa doubled bonuses for its 2,300 full-time workers.

The Prospector Hotel in Ely gave its employees a \$500 bonus and raised its starting wages.

McDonald's, which has around 9,000 employees in my State, is expanding its education benefits program, tripling the amount of money eligible workers can receive to help cover the cost of college tuition.

Lowe's Home Improvement, which employs more than 2,000 Nevadans, announced it is expanding benefits, such as adoption assistance and parental paid leave, and giving bonuses of up to \$1,000 to its employees.

Walmart announced it will increase wages, give eligible employees a special bonus of \$1,000, and expand maternity and parental leave benefits—benefiting up to 8,700 Walmart associates who are living in the great State of Nevada.

CVS, which has roughly 2,000 employees and 100 stores in Nevada, announced that effective this month, it will increase the starting salary and wages for hourly employees.

Developers of the stalled Fontainebleau Resort, recently renamed the Drew, announced they will resume the project and have committed to creating over 10,000 new jobs.

A-1 Steel, which is based in Sparks, NV, implemented eight paid holidays for its employees.

Finally, Cox Communications said it will give around 1,750 Nevadans bonuses of up to \$2,000 today. Yes, on tax day they will be giving their employees bonuses of up to \$2,000. This is just the beginning.

During a phone call from the National Federation of Independent Business in Nevada, roughly 9 in 10 Nevada business owners said that because of the new tax law, they plan to take action that includes increasing workers' wages and investing in their companies. Several companies are also pledging to put more of their capital back into our country rather than overseas.

Apple, which recently broke ground on a new facility in Reno, announced it will create 20,000 new jobs nationally, open a new campus, and directly contribute \$350 billion to the U.S. economy over the next 5 years.

Make no mistake about it, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is working for the people in Nevada. Despite the bill's critics, who have described these tax cuts as "crumbs" and said it is "the worst bill in the history of the U.S. Congress," this new bill couldn't have

come at a better time. Let me tell you again why.

Under the failed economic policies of the Obama administration, Nevadans suffered through 8 years of historically low economic growth. Think about this. In those 8 years, the average economy growth was less than 2 percent. As a result, wages and workers suffered, job creation suffered, and the middle class in America suffered.

It has been reported that nearly 8 in 10 Americans who work full time are living paycheck to paycheck, and if you live in Nevada, you are more likely to be living paycheck to paycheck than if you lived anywhere else.

Whether it is a single mother, who is taking classes to further her education to give her kids a good life, or the police officer and teacher with four children in Southern Nevada who tell me that they are barely getting by and are doing the best they can, families in my State are trying to plan for their futures. They have told me they are struggling, but it is not just Nevadans who felt the squeeze.

Nearly two-thirds of Americans don't even have \$500 set aside to cover an unexpected emergency expense. That is why, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I worked to help write this legislation. I fought to pass these meaningful tax cuts for the people of my State because they have been waiting too long for a break.

I was proud to propose and secure a provision in the new law that doubles the child tax credit to \$2,000 per child. Think about this. The enhanced child tax credit could mean enough money for a family of 4 to cover more than 6 months' worth of groceries, buy school supplies for 4 kids, and purchase more than 9,000 diapers. It will allow families to better plan for their futures.

Take Sarah as an example, a single mom living in Nevada. She told us she used her child tax credit to help her and her four children move out of a family shelter and pay rent a full year in advance.

In addition to doubling the child tax credit, we doubled the standard deduction, cut rates for low-income and middle-class families. It is expected that a typical family of four will keep more than \$2,000 this year.

It also lowered rates on businesses to ensure that we are globally competitive and help incite economic growth. I am pleased this bill included my provision to make it easier for startups to give more junior employees an ownership stake in their company's success.

I have been fighting for tax reform for years, and last year we set out to cut taxes for hard-working Americans and agreed to a framework that included three main goals: create more jobs, increase wages, and boost American competitiveness. Even though it has only been a few months, I believe we have already achieved all three of those.

As the son of an auto mechanic and a school cook, I grew up watching my

parents work hard to provide for me and my five brothers and sisters and to provide a good life. They told us that if we worked hard and played by the rules, then we, too, could achieve the American dream.

Our problem today is that too many people think that the American dream is out of reach. That is what tax relief legislation is all about—empowering families to give them a better chance to get ahead and to prepare for their futures.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has put my State and our country on the right track to economic prosperity, and I look forward to seeing what the rest of the year brings for Nevada families and their workers.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I just had a chance to hear my colleague from Nevada talk a little bit about the importance of the tax cuts and tax reform that this Chamber passed at the end of the year and that is now in effect.

All I can say to my constituents is, this is the last year you are going to have to file under the old code. You will have the new code next year. Why is that important? Because it is simpler. It doubles the standard deduction, as an example, which is a great simplification for a lot of taxpayers. It also takes about 3 million people off the tax rolls altogether.

Think about that. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, over 3 million Americans, who currently have income tax liability, will no longer have it under this new tax reform bill. Why? Because it focuses on lowering the rates, doubling the standard deduction, and doubling the child tax credit. That helps people who are lower income Americans, who right now have tax liabilities and will not in the future. So it will be easier for a lot of people a year from now because they will have no tax-filing debate because they will not have any tax liability, and for others, it is just a simpler form.

What is already happening this year is that the paychecks are changing. Why? Because the IRS is saying the employees are going to get more money in their paychecks because the employers are going to withhold less as we go into 2018 because the tax proposals went into effect at the beginning of this year. So even though this is the last time we will have to file under the old code, people are already seeing some of the benefits of tax reform.

When I go around Ohio, I talk to people, and they say: You know, ROB, my paycheck has already changed. That is because 90 percent of Americans are now being told they will have less withholding taken out of their paychecks, again, because of the lower tax rate, doubling of the child tax credit, and doubling of the standard deduction.

This is really helping. The average person in Ohio will probably see maybe \$30, \$40, \$50 every 2 weeks in their paycheck. That adds up. The average in Ohio for a median income family is about \$2,000 a year in tax relief. That is the average. That is a big deal. That is not just crumbs.

Most people I represent live paycheck to paycheck. Most people I represent think \$2,000 is really helpful. By the way, they tell me they are using it. It might be for a long-planned vacation they couldn't afford. It might be, as a couple of people have told me, to help with healthcare because they couldn't afford to buy healthcare until they had that extra \$2,000 in their pocket—or more for some people—to be able to afford healthcare.

For others—we heard a great story this morning from my colleague from West Virginia about a woman who said her daughter used to have to do her schoolwork at school or maybe at the library. She couldn't come home to do it because they couldn't afford high-speed internet. Now she can afford high-speed internet with this tax relief that is being provided. So this is something that is actually affecting people right now.

As you go to the post office to mail your form today, or as you send it in electronically, just know it is going to get a little bit better, a little bit simpler, with a little bit less tax liability.

By the way, the IRS has had some difficulty in accepting electronic filings today—another reason we actually have had to go beyond just tax reform, as important as that is, because we have to ensure we have an IRS that is working for the American taxpayer. The taxpayer service, the number of calls that are being answered, the number of answers which will be given correctly, all of those indicators are concerning right now. So we do need to ensure that the IRS has adequate funding to respond to taxpayers but also that there are reforms at the IRS so their computer systems do work, so the different stovepipe systems are talking to each other.

So tax reform and tax relief are very important but also, as we have seen today with this glitch with regard to electronic filing, we have to make sure the IRS is up to the task and providing the taxpayer service that people deserve.

The tax relief effort, though, wasn't just for families and individuals. It also focuses on business relief. Why? Because we know American companies were not competitive under the old code. You had investment going overseas and you had jobs going overseas. There is tax relief for small businesses and large businesses alike. We are hearing more about that because we have seen a lot of headlines.

There was another one today about yet another major company that is making some investments in this country.

I was at the Kroger company yesterday. Kroger is one of the largest em-

ployers in the United States. It is a great grocery store chain—the largest in the country, by the way. They happen to be headquartered in Ohio. They made a huge announcement yesterday. They said they are going to take the savings they got from the tax relief and tax reform measure, and they are going to substantially give it back to their employees.

The things they talked about were very interesting. One is to increase the 401(k) match. That is important. They already give a 100-percent match. Now they are going to do it at 5 percent, rather than 4 percent, of people's salary. That is nice because people can save more for their own retirement.

They talked about helping employees who are having a tough time through the employee assistance program. They are increasing funding for that program. They talked about the employee discount program so the employees can buy more from their own stores, expanding more things they can buy and how much they can buy with discounts. That helps their employees.

They also talked about something I thought was really great, which is continuing education—lifelong learning. They said they are going to provide their employees with a \$3,500-a-year—\$3,500-a-year—stipend to continue their education. Maybe it is getting a GED, or maybe it is getting an MBA and everything in between, but they believe in education. They want to help these employees be able to better themselves. They believe that will also help them to keep people longer term. This is part of how they are using the tax cut.

By the way, it is applicable to everybody who has been there for 6 months. You only have to be there for 6 months to apply for this. You can be there part time or full time, and you get this assistance for education. This is all coming from the tax relief this body passed.

Is it making a difference in the lives of your constituents? It certainly is in the lives of my mine; I can tell you that.

I have now been to 13 different businesses around the State of Ohio, and I have asked them this question directly: What is happening? What are you doing? All of them tell me they are investing either in their people or they are investing in their plants and equipment, helping the technology so people can be more competitive and more effective at doing their jobs.

I have also had a half dozen roundtable discussions, where I bring small business owners together, and dozens of businesses have told me what they are doing. Some are providing more healthcare coverage. In a couple of cases—one is a small craft brewer in Ohio, another is an auto parts company—they are providing healthcare for their employees for the first time.

In one case, they had it before it got too expensive because of the Affordable Care Act, and now they are able to provide healthcare for their employees.

Another one had never provided healthcare because it was a small business just getting started, and now they can provide healthcare for their employees because of the savings from the tax bill.

Others are doing much more in terms of the community and charitable giving, again, some with regard to 401(k)s and some with regard to new equipment and machines to make their employees more productive.

When economists look at what is going on in our economy, they think: Gosh, the reason wages haven't gone up much in the last decade—and, really, it has been flat in Ohio—is because work productivity has not been high enough. Well, this tax reform effort is providing more investment to our companies.

I would much rather have people investing here in America than investing overseas, and that is what was happening. Three times as many American companies were bought by foreign companies last year, instead of the other way around because of our Tax Code. There was a study out by Ernst & Young that said 4,700 of companies went overseas. When they do that, they take their investment with them. They take some of their R&D with them.

We have done studies on this to be able to show that 4,700 companies had gone overseas that would have stayed—American companies—just over the last 13 years if we had the kind of tax reform in place we now have. Those companies now have incentive to be here. They have incentive to invest here.

Foreign companies now have an incentive to invest here. When they are trying to decide between investing in Japan, China, or Europe, now they look here and say: This is a lower tax rate, and you get immediate expensing. In other words, when you buy something, you can expense it more quickly, deduct it more quickly. That encourages investment here, whether you are a U.S. company or a foreign company. That is why this is exciting.

There is some new information out from the Congressional Budget Office that talks about economic growth, and it says that because of the tax reform effort, we are seeing higher growth rates. For this year—the year we are in right now—the Congressional Budget Office had projected 2 percent economic growth—pretty weak. I mean, it is growth, but it is not enough to get wages up. It is not enough to really get people the opportunities they are looking for when they work hard and play by the rules. Guess what they are saying now: 3.3 percent, not 2 percent. So 3.3 percent economic growth is projected for this year. Again, they say this is largely attributable to the pro-growth policies included in the tax reform effort we are talking about—the tax cuts.

They also say that for the first time in a long time, we are seeing wages going up. They project wages going up. When we look at last month and the

month before, we can see these wages start creeping back up again.

This is really exciting to me because, ultimately, we want to see economic growth, yes, but we really want to see working families be able to see a little higher income so that they are not stuck in this squeeze where their income is flat and yet their expenses are up.

What is the biggest expense that has been increasing? Healthcare. So, yes, we have to do more on healthcare and, yes, we have to do more to increase economic growth, but wouldn't it be great to have wages going up to be able to compensate for that and to give people again the sense that if they are doing the right things in life, if they are willing to work hard and play by the rules, they can get ahead and their kids and their grandkids can get ahead too.

So I am excited to be here today to say that this is the last day we have to file under the old Tax Code but also to say that the new Tax Code is helping to give the families that I represent the opportunity to do a little better, to give businesses that I represent the opportunity to be more competitive and to reinvest in their employees and to reinvest in their businesses and their competitiveness and their productivity. That, ultimately, is what is going to make the biggest difference in this tax reform effort.

With that, I see that one of my colleagues is here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

S. RES. 463

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, this is a very focused topic and I will just be a few minutes.

I rise today to discuss S. Res. 463, which is a resolution that Senator BLUNT and I just discharged from the Rules Committee that will help new parents—specifically, Senator parents—to bring their infant children onto the Senate floor. It hasn't been brought to the Senate floor yet, but I thought I would give an update and explain the importance and really the historic nature of this resolution.

As my colleagues know, this month Senator DUCKWORTH made history when she gave birth to her beautiful daughter Maile Pearl. Senator DUCKWORTH has made history in many ways but, among other things, she is the first sitting U.S. Senator to give birth while in office.

Some have pointed out that it is remarkable that it took so long to have a Senator who gave birth while in office, and I think it does speak to the fact that while we are a growing number of women in Congress, there are still not that many, and it is changing.

We currently now have 23 women Senators, which is an all-time record—more than at any time in history. We are seeing record levels of women run for office. It is inevitable that in the future more women will have kids dur-

ing their time in the Senate. So in this way, we are simply anticipating what we see as the future, and it is on us to make this a better workplace before they get here. I think workplaces across America are making, and have made, those same kinds of adjustments and decisions.

As the ranking member of the Rules Committee, I recognize that this means that some of our outdated rules—and Senator BLUNT as the chair realizes this as well—that were developed without considering the changing needs in the workplace must be changed. Senator DUCKWORTH has taken the lead, and her resolution is an important part of that change.

As she prepared to give birth, Senator DUCKWORTH did what many moms do. She started to come up with a plan for how to juggle her family and her work. Like too many other moms in the United States, she came to realize that there were problems in her workplace for accommodating new moms.

Senators have important constitutional obligations related to their service, the most fundamental among them being voting on legislation. The Senate rules require Senators to vote in person. We have no intention of changing that. They must vote on the Senate floor, and no one can do it for them.

Right now, unlike in the House, children are not allowed on the Senate floor. That means that in order to fulfill her Senate obligation, Senator DUCKWORTH would have to leave her baby for extended periods in order to come in and vote. Sometimes that would be just fine. She would have childcare. Her husband would be there. But as we all know, there are times when we vote late into the night, when we vote at unpredictable times, and it doesn't work for a mom with a newborn.

So what did Senator DUCKWORTH do? She called for legislation to change the rules so that Senators can bring their infants on the floor during votes, and we worked to come up with a workable proposal.

I am proud to say that this week, the Senate Rules Committee swiftly discharged the legislation so that it can be passed by the full Senate, because that is what working moms do. They stick together and they get the job done.

Sticking together means recognizing that we have a lot of work to do inside the Halls of Congress. The truth is too many American moms aren't in positions of power to change the rules, which is why it is so important for those of us who are in positions of power to be champions of change, not just here in the Senate but in workplaces across the country. It is wrong that America is the only industrialized country without a law that requires paid maternity leave, and it is wrong that only 10 percent of American employers offer workers full pay during parental leave.

The lack of parental leave, coupled with the cost of childcare, has a profound impact on our economy and on our society, and it is one of the reasons, I believe, why there are not enough women in power. We must do better.

Adopting Senator DUCKWORTH's resolution represents a small step forward. In fact, it is one baby forward. In answer to some of the questions that I got in the hallway, no, there will not be wardrobe requirements of the baby, and, no, we do not believe the baby will be required to wear a Senate pin.

Somehow, I think we will be able to adjust to this simple notion to allow a child—an infant—on the floor for the first year of life. That is why I am hopeful that this will inspire further change both inside and outside of Congress.

In addition to the support of all of the women Senators, I would like to thank Chairman BLUNT, Leaders MCCONNELL and SCHUMER, and Senator DURBIN, Senator DUCKWORTH's colleague, who all played an instrumental role in getting this resolution to the floor. Women may be leading the charge, but there are a lot of good men who have had our backs, and that is a good thing, because we need to work together as we continue to fight for more family-friendly workplaces.

Finally, I would like to thank the one who did all the work, Senator DUCKWORTH, who continues to serve our country with courage and strength, for paving the way. Maile Pearl is very lucky to have Senator DUCKWORTH as a mom, and I look forward to meeting her here on the Senate floor during a future round of votes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 167. An act to designate a National Memorial to Fallen Educators at the National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia, Kansas.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 146. An act to take certain Federal lands in Tennessee into trust for the benefit of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes.

H.R. 443. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the James K. Polk Home in Columbia, Tennessee, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3607. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish fees for medical services provided in units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3961. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Kissimmee River and its tributaries in the State of Florida for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4609. An act to provide for the conveyance of a Forest Service site in Dolores County, Colorado, to be used for a fire station.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 146. An act to take certain Federal lands in Tennessee into trust for the benefit of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 3607. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish fees for medical services provided in units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3961. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Kissimmee River and its tributaries in the State of Florida for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4609. An act to provide for the conveyance of a Forest Service site in Dolores County, Colorado, to be used for a fire station; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4915. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4916. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursu-

ant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic that was declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4917. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4918. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2018; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4919. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Strategic Plan for the Department of Health and Human Services for fiscal years 2018-2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4920. A communication from the Impact Analyst, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedule for Rating Disabilities: The Organs of Special Sense and Schedule of Ratings—Eye" (RIN2900-AP14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2018; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-199. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho memorializing its opposition to any new federal national monument designations or further designations of wilderness in the State of Idaho without the approval of the United States Congress and the Idaho Legislature; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 103

Whereas, the Antiquities Act was passed by the United States Congress and signed into law by President Theodore Roosevelt on June 8, 1906. The law gives the President of the United States the authority to, by presidential proclamation, create national monuments from federal lands to protect significant natural, cultural or scientific features. The law has been used more than one hundred times since its passage; and

Whereas, the Wilderness Act was passed in 1964 and, since that time, the United States Congress has designated nearly 110 million acres of federal wildlands as official wilderness, which has the highest form of protection of any federal wildland; and

Whereas, almost sixty-two percent of land in Idaho is federal land; and

Whereas, residents of the State of Idaho support multiple use of public land. Current multiple use and private land protection policies governing the management of public land in Idaho have generally served and sustained the interests of Idaho residents; and

Whereas, ranching and agriculture play a substantial role in the state's heritage and identity and should be preserved; and

Whereas, ranching, agriculture, mining, the forestry industry and recreation are primary economic drivers in the state, with agribusiness and recreation each contributing