United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 2017 No. 97

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 7, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE JOHNSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

TURKISH CRACKDOWN ON PEACEFUL PROTESTERS

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, a group of peaceful protesters gathered at a public park outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence in northwest Washington, D.C. They came from a variety of backgrounds—Armenian, Kurdish, Yazidi, and more—but they shared a common concern about developments in Turkey, including the crackdown on political opposition and free speech in that country and Turkey's continued denial of the Armenian genocide.

About a mile away, Turkey's President, Tayyip Erdogan was received warmly by President Trump at the White House, with no mention of Turkey's human rights abuses and growing authoritarianism. The protesters felt, and rightly so, that they had to exercise their First Amendment rights and raise their voices in dissent, the very dissent which has been violently squelched by Erdogan in his own country.

What happened next was a chaotic and violent confrontation that left 11 people injured, 2 of whom required hospitalization. Tensions were already high, with pro-Turkish counter-protesters outside the residence scuffling with protesters.

When Erdogan and his entourage arrived, the situation quickly spiraled out of control. As he exited his car, observing the protests, Erdogan can be seen on video speaking briefly to his security detail, and soon thereafter, several of these men, some of them armed with handguns, rushed past D.C. police officers to violently confront protesters, causing several injuries.

The images that you see to my right are indelible and bloody. A Kurdish woman was put in a choke hold and told by the dark-suited man who attacked her that he was going to kill her. Protesters, men and women alike, were knocked to the ground and assaulted with kicks to the face and torso.

This was not a scuffle. It was a full-fledged assault by professional thugs on a peaceful protest. Such scenes have become common in Turkey, where state-sponsored violence and repression have become the chief instrument to cement Erdogan's power.

Selahattin Demirtas was, until recently, the leader of the Kurdish HDP party and someone I had the honor to meet 2 years ago, and now he sits in prison as prosecutors seek to sentence him to 143 years of confinement.

Turkey has become the world's leading jailer of journalists, most recently adding French photojournalist Mathias Depardon, held in solitary confinement and without charge, to the ranks of 81 journalists currently imprisoned.

Mr. Speaker, Erdogan cannot export the violent repression he visits on his own citizens to our streets. The violence of May 16 can't go unanswered or forgotten.

Yesterday the House unanimously passed H. Res. 354, condemning the attacks and calling on the administration to pursue justice and hold those who carried out these attacks responsible, whether they be Turkish or not.

This is a good start, but it cannot be the end. The D.C. police department is carrying out an investigation into the attacks, and ultimately they will require cooperation from Turkish authorities in identifying those responsible. Nothing that Turkey has done so far indicates that that cooperation will be forthcoming, and indeed, rather than show even the slightest contrition after their security forces assaulted Americans, authorities in Ankara instead summoned the U.S. Ambassador to lodge a complaint against the United States and police officers who sought to keep the peace. The message from Turkey is as clear as day: We can do as we please whether at home to our own citizens or on your own American soil.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to affirm that we will not allow Turkey to beat innocent protesters on the streets of our Nation's capital. We will continue to pursue justice and to make clear that America will always stand up for the right of peaceful and free expression.

Printed on recycled paper.

THE NEED FOR FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the importance of the U.S. International Affairs Budget for America's economic prosperity. Recently, more than 220 leaders from America's business community, from Fortune 500 companies to local chambers of commerce, wrote to Secretary of State Rex Tillerson about the strategic investments in development and diplomacy that advance America's interests overseas and support jobs at home.

I am particularly proud that the CEOs of Land O'Lakes and Cargill—two Minnesota-based companies—helped lead this critical effort. Minnesota businesses understand they need the support of America's diplomats and development professionals at the State Department and USAID in the international marketplace to succeed.

For less than 1 percent of the Federal budget, our diplomats and development workers help create good governance and stability in developing countries around the world. These efforts enable their economies to grow, creating new markets for American goods in a highly competitive global marketplace.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers living outside of our borders, some of our fastest growing economies are in developing countries. Currently, 41 million American jobs depend on international trade, including 800,000 in the great State of Minnesota. We simply can't afford to disengage from the world. We also know that individuals who experience economic growth and trade with one another prefer peace over conflict.

If the United States is to remain an economic powerhouse that continues to create jobs for hardworking Americans here at home, we must invest in our critical development and diplomacy agencies. If we don't, our economic competitors and, God forbid, our enemies certainly will.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to protect funding for the International Affairs Budget.

A WELL-DESERVED AWARD

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the career of Forest Lake Area Schools' early childhood special education teacher, Heide Muhs. Heide is retiring at the end of this school year. Heide is concluding her professional career in education with a huge achievement. Recently she received the Early Childhood Professional of the Year Lifetime Excellence Award. This award recognizes an individual who has made a lasting difference in the lives of children with special needs and their families. This is an area where Heide has excelled during her career.

Heide is no stranger to the needs of these families. For her, it is personal. In fact, she has two adopted sons with special needs. Through her personal experience and unwavering dedication to those in her care, Heide has managed to help and strengthen families throughout central Minnesota.

I am proud to stand here today and to thank Heide for her commitment to our children's future. We wish you the best in your retirement, Heide. You deserve it.

BUSH FELLOWSHIP FOR MINNESOTANS

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the achievements of two Minnesotans from my district. Scott Glew of Elk River and Emmanuel Oppong of St. Cloud have received Bush Fellowships.

During his service in the Army National Guard, Scott was deeply affected by the human suffering he witnessed. That is why, in his current job as an educator, Scott is determined to teach his students about global conflicts. He has advocated for making social studies a main component of our students' curriculum. With his fellowship, Scott plans to earn a Ph.D. to expand and improve upon our education curriculum.

Mr. Oppong is originally from Ghana and knows firsthand that mental health is not a priority for many cultures. That is why he works as a counselor for immigrants and refugees dealing with culture shock and trauma. With his fellowship, Emmanuel plans to learn how to raise awareness of mental health issues and implement education plans to improve the health and well-being of our communities.

I am deeply impressed with these individuals and their commitment to the common good, and I wish them well as they pursue their goals.

AN INCREDIBLE GOLD STAR

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Ally Haas, a student at Sartell High School. Recently, Ally completed a project that has helped elementary students at St. Francis Xavier Elementary School by pairing them with high school and college students for weekly tutoring sessions. The project has been incredibly successful.

Due to the success of her project, Ally received a Gold Award from the Girl Scouts. This is the highest award the Girl Scouts has to offer. It is no coincidence that Ally has become such a civic-minded young woman, as she is a fourth-generation Girl Scout. In fact, Ally's mother received the Gold Award in 1985.

Congratulations, Ally. We are proud of you and we are looking forward to your bright future and continued success.

HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, we waste a lot of time in the House Judiciary Committee passing bills we have already passed year after year that go nowhere. But now evidence is growing that our elections were interfered with by a foreign adversary, evidence that the President and Attorney General have been less than truthful about their meetings and relationship with this foreign adversary. And other committees in this body and the Senate and at the Justice Department have launched investigations into the behavior and truthfulness of the President, his subordinates, his family; but from the House Judiciary Committee, we have heard exactly nothing, not a peep, not a hearing or a subpoena, nada, zip, nothing. Just crickets.

When I joined the Judiciary Committee, I remember hearing something about how the committee has jurisdiction over the enforcement of laws, the courts, the conduct of the executive branch, especially when it comes to law enforcement agencies like the FBI, Justice Department, activities that may or may not be criminal.

And guess what. I was right. You need look no further than the committee's website, where it proudly proclaims: ''The committee's weighty agenda has frequently placed it in a central role in American politics, most notably during its consideration of impeachment charges against Presidents of the United States in both 1974 and 1998.''

So with all due respect to the Intelligence Committee, the Oversight Committee, and our colleagues in the Senate, it is the Judiciary Committee in the House where impeachment begins. We are like the grand jury of the House of Representatives when it comes to impeachment.

Robert Mueller, the former FBI Director investigating the President, will not be able to indict him while he is President no matter what he uncovers. Most legal scholars argue a sitting President cannot be indicted in criminal court.

So it is the Judiciary Committee that will bring charges if there is evidence of ''Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors,'' as provided in Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution.

But here we are with evidence that the Attorney General lied to a committee of Congress about his contacts with senior Russian officials and lied on his security clearance application about contacts with Russian officials who are suspected by our government of being covert espionage operatives, with evidence that hacking and other activities, in fact, took place directed by Russia. And nothing from the Judiciary Committee.

The Attorney General publicly recused himself from any matters at the Justice Department related to the investigation of Russia contacts, but the Attorney General played a role in the firing of FBI Director James Comey. And we know now, because the President said so, that the firing of Comey, the FBI Director that was investigating him, was done because the

President said he was ''under great pressure'' from the Russia investigation. And still nothing from the Judiciary Committee.

Now, let's go back to those two dates when the Judiciary Committee says we played a central role in American politics. In 1974, we had a criminal conspiracy that involved tampering with elections that went all the way to the Oval Office. It involved firing senior Justice Department officials who were part of the investigation. They asked the intelligence community to discredit those investigations in 1974. And there were secretly recorded conversations.

Sound familiar?

President Nixon soon resigned because he knew what was coming.

In 1998, the issue of whether the President of the United States had lied to a grand jury about an extramarital sexual encounter with a consenting adult who was a subordinate, that is what that was about. House Judiciary Chairman Henry Hyde of the great State of Illinois, who, as it turned out, knew a thing or two about extramarital sexual encounters with consenting adults, passed four Articles of Impeachment, along an almost exclusively party-line vote. An impeachment trial was held in the Senate, which became an epic embarrassment to the Republican Party and to this body. But now, given all of the evidence of electoral tampering, the apparent efforts to cover it up, the actions of the President and the Attorney General to deflect and derail investigations, that, to me and to others, appears to be attempts at or actual obstruction of justice.

From the committee of jurisdiction that is supposed to be in charge and taking action, what do we have? Not a peep, not a hearing, not a subpoena, nada, zip, nothing. Just crickets.

Mr. Speaker, that has got to change, and I suspect it will, because it has to. The Constitution says it has to.

Judiciary Committee, it is time to act and fulfill your constitutional responsibilities.

□ 1015

PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Trump on his decision to withdraw from the Paris climate accord.

For emphasis, the Paris climate accord is not now and never has been an agreement that binds the United States of America because it was never ratified by Congress.

More specifically, the Paris climate accord, a treaty, was never ratified by the Senate pursuant to Article II, section 2 of the United States Constitution.

Rather, in yet another example of disdain for America's constitutional Republic, the Obama administration refused to seek Senate approval of the treaty.

By declining to move forward on a poorly negotiated bad deal, President Trump kept his promise to the American people to put America first.

Lest there be any doubt, the Paris climate accord intentionally hurt America to the benefit of competitor nations. In a global redistribution of the wealth scheme, the Paris climate accord called for America to give away tens of billions of dollars to other countries. That is tens of billions of additional taxpayer dollars on top of America's existing foreign aid giveaways. That is money America does not have, has to borrow to get, and cannot afford to pay back. That is nuts.

America must stop borrowing money to send overseas to help other countries take jobs from Americans. Is that really so hard for the left to understand?

The Paris climate accord undermined America's economy by putting American employees at a competitive disadvantage. By way of but one example, a comprehensive new study prepared by NERA Economic Consulting estimates that the Paris climate accord could cost the American economy $3 trillion in gross domestic product and 6.5 million industrial sector jobs over the next two decades.

President Trump is right. America must lead by putting America's national interests first. The Paris climate accord failed to do that.

By way of example, under the Paris climate accord, China and India, two of the biggest and worst polluters on Earth, have no new air pollution control obligations until 2030, at the earliest.

Contrast the abysmal environmental record of China and India with that of America. And let's be clear, without a Paris climate accord, America's carbon dioxide emissions have been and are being reduced. For example, between the years 2000 and 2014, the United States reduced its carbon dioxide emissions by more than 18 percent.

Further, over the past 50 years, America has been the world's environmental leader. No country on Earth has done more to reduce pollution by cleaning our air, cleaning our water, and properly disposing of hazardous waste. That 50-year record is compelling evidence that America's focus on being good environmental stewards will continue, with or without the Paris climate accord. That is world leadership.

I know of nothing that says we are going to stop being the world's environmental leader. That 50-year record is also compelling evidence that America can and will lead on our own without hamstringing ourselves with a badly negotiated, one-sided Paris climate accord that reduces America's wealth while costing struggling American families their jobs.

In summary, I am proud that President Trump puts America first. America should not and must not yield even a smidgen of our national sovereignty to the dictates of other, lesser nations.

Despite liberal climate-scare and socialist Democrat hysteria to the contrary, America has been and is, by almost every standard, the greatest Nation in world history.

With an America First attitude, America will continue its 75-year streak as the greatest Nation in the history of the world, second to none.

EXTEND HAITIAN TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 6-month extension for Haitian temporary protected status recipients living in the United States, and for whom I believe our country should offer permanent residency. Temporary protected status, also known as TPS, offers forms of relief from removal under changing living conditions.

In 2010, Haiti was struck by the worst earthquake in the past 200 years, killing more than 160,000 people and displacing close to 1.5 million.

The United States played an intricate role in bringing some of the Haitians to the United States, providing them with a safe haven, because that is what we do.

Booker Washington captured well the importance of assisting people in need when he said: ''The highest test of the civilization of any race is in its willingness to extend a helping hand to the less fortunate.'' With this in mind, America should move the temporary protected status to permanent residency.

Return of the Haitian natives would only continue to set back the progress Haiti has made. The country of Haiti continues to feel the ramifications of the 2010 earthquake. Tens of thousands of people sleep in the streets or under plastic sheets in makeshift camps. The conditions that Haitians endure in the country has led to the spread of disease, which has become a major concern. The cholera epidemic has affected nearly 800,000 Haitians, killing over 9,000. Cholera is primarily found in countries with inadequate access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene. In short, the quality of living in Haiti has created a need for a better life.

The economic disparity, extreme poverty, and underdevelopment of Haiti continues to loom. Though it is an island nation with rich culture, Haiti remains the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. Among the 9 million people who reside in Haiti, over half live in extreme poverty, some even living on less than a dollar a day. While in the United States, people continue to contribute to our economy,

our diversity, and to our ever-evolving culture. This embodies the epitome of a mutualistic relationship.

The people of Haiti and the United States have had a long and complex relationship dating back to pre-slavery days. Our cultures and our respective economic histories and destinies are deeply intertwined.

I greatly urge my colleagues to support the permanent extension of Haitians being protected from mass deportation. For 7 years, these Haitians have greatly benefited the American communities of which they have been a part. To pull them away from these communities at such a pivotal point in both the United States' and Haiti's history would equate to nothing short of gross negligence. Let us not neglect the principle of which our Nation was founded upon and continue to assume the role of our predecessors. Help those who are less fortunate.

VENEZUELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 months alone, reports indicate that nearly 3,000 Venezuelans have been jailed and 69 have been killed by the regime. Peaceful protests have led Venezuelan strongman Nicolas Maduro to issue a decree to convene a constituent National Assembly, what he calls a constituente, in order to rewrite Venezuela's constitution.

But as we all know, Mr. Speaker, Maduro is fooling no one. This is just another attempt to undermine and discredit the current democratically elected legislature in the National Assembly. Another attempt of a power grab which seeks to consolidate more power around the executive and possibly rewrite the constitution to favor only one individual: Nicolas Maduro. Another attempt to pull a fast one over some in the international community who may make the mistake and call this weak and dangerous gesture progress.

But we know the truth. This is not progress. In fact, this is a major setback to democracy. Maduro is once again trying to delay the inevitable: free, fair, transparent, and democratic elections in Venezuela under the supervision of credible international observers.

Making matters worse, Goldman Sachs is also adding to the Venezuelan people's misery. Last week, the investment bank bought $2.8 billion in Venezuelan bonds, not only providing the Maduro regime a lifeline in the short term but saddling the Venezuelan people with crippling debt repayments in the long term.

When, not if, a democratically elected president comes to the Venezuelan people, they will be stuck with the bill and face the responsibility to pay for this debt.

With so many Venezuelans lacking basic goods, including food, many have taken to calling these bonds hunger bonds, as the regime lines its own pockets and the Venezuelan people continue to suffer.

This is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker. Venezuela's pervasive corruption means any infusion of cash like Goldman Sachs will not benefit the people of Venezuela who desperately need it. Instead, Maduro and his thugs fill their coffers and use the cash to abuse the Venezuelan people and use it to stay in power.

Venezuela's state-owned oil company, PDVSA, was already sanctioned in the year 2011, for helping Iran avoid its own sanctions. Venezuela's Tarek El Aissami, second in command to Maduro, was sanctioned by our U.S. Treasury Department early this year under the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act. Can you imagine? The regime's longstanding ties to drug trafficking and other illicit activities are only now being exposed, and U.S. businesses should be avoiding deals with Maduro like the plague.

But the private sector is not the only one aiding the Maduro regime. Sadly, the U.S. government is also helping prop up the regime. How? By allowing purchases of Venezuelan oil. This keeps Maduro afloat. In 2016, Venezuela remained the third largest foreign crude oil supplier to the United States behind Canada and Saudi Arabia. In 2016, oil exports from Venezuela were valued at $10.5 billion. During the first 3 months of 2017, value of oil exports from Venezuela to us here in the United States was already worth $3.5 billion. Financial transactions like these made to Maduro or any other despotic regime should be prevented.

We have a moral obligation to respect the suffering needs of the Venezuelan people and help alleviate this suffering.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, later today, together with Israel's Ambassador to the United States, Ron Dermer, we will be joined live from Jerusalem by Prime Minister Netanyahu and Speaker of the Knesset Edelstein for a special event to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem—Israel's eternal capital.

I led a congressional delegation visit to Israel last week, and we met with both Prime Minister Netanyahu and Speaker Edelstein at the Knesset in Jerusalem.

□ 1030

We also toured the famous City of David and saw discoveries that prove, without a doubt, that Jews have lived in Jerusalem for millennia. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because there are efforts at the United Nations—at UNESCO and the Human Rights Council—that seek to erase all Jewish ties to Jerusalem.

As we are set to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Jerusalem's reunification, we should take this opportunity to rebuff such efforts at the U.N. and, instead, reinforce that Jerusalem is, was, and always will be the eternal home of the Jewish people.

HEALTHY FARMS: HEALTHY ECONOMY AND A SECURE NATION

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the foundation of healthy living and healthy communities: our food, which comes from our farms.

This month is both National Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Month and National Dairy Month. Although we should bring attention to the importance of eating these nutrient-rich foods, dairy and fresh fruits and vegetables play a much larger role, as we know, in the health of our communities and our country, and they do so not just by providing us food.

In California, we know that dairy products and fresh fruits and vegetables are an integral part of our healthy community and a strong economy. Our farmers also provide economic development in other sectors as businesses are created and expand, investments are made, and innovations arise to support the needs of these farmers and farm communities.

But the economic contributions of California agriculture—American agriculture—do not end at our borders. In California, we produce half of the Nation's fruits and vegetables, and we are the top milk producing State in the Nation. The men and women who own and work on these farms provide both nutritious food for our families and create thousands of jobs across the country.

We know we must make sure that our farmers have the tools to do so, but our farmers need a reliable source of water, a legal and stable workforce, and access to export markets, in other words, fair trade agreements.

We must also ensure that American agriculture is sustainable. We must continue to ensure that it is sustainable for our well-being and the well-being of future generations to come because the bottom line is food does not come from a grocery store. Food comes from our farmers and the land that they farm.

Our food supply is a national security issue, but it never really gets looked at in that light. So by investing in critical programs and infrastructure projects—by ensuring that our farmers have the water, the workforce, and the access to foreign markets—we are not only investing in our farms, but we are investing in the long-term health and security of our Nation.

What is more, people don't realize it, but less than 3 percent of our Nation's population is directly involved in the

production of food and fiber. This is part of the amazing development of American agriculture. So equally crucial for the sustainability of American agriculture are our export markets and our trade agreements. That means improving NAFTA, continuing to engage with our European allies, and not turning our back on Asia.

In fiscal year 2016, the United States exported $129 billion worth of agricultural products. We not only feed our Nation every night, but we grow more than enough to export abroad. We must maintain good relations with our top trade partners and continue to lower trade barriers to existing and new foreign markets.

So let's not just focus on healthy eating during National Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Month and National Dairy Month; let's take the opportunity to discuss how we will work together to ensure that our farmers, ranchers, and dairymen and -women can continue to contribute not only to America's dinner tables, but to our communities and to our economy. The health and security of our Nation depends on it.

CONGRATULATING ANANYA VINAY

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, let me also give a shout-out to Ananya Vinay, the 2017 National Spelling Bee champion, from Fresno, California. We are all proud of her accomplishments. Obviously, this young lady has a great future ahead of her.

Congratulations, once again, on becoming the 2017 National Spelling Bee champion.

HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF ROY HERTEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of my friend Roy Hertel, who passed away Thursday, May 25, at the age of 68.

Roy was a true public servant and community leader in Montgomery County, Illinois. Throughout his life and career, he held many roles in the region and had an immeasurable impact on countless lives, including mine.

As a teacher, circuit clerk, county board chairman, and administrator for the county's Department of Health and Human Services in the State of Illinois, Roy's career was defined by his dedication to bettering the lives of those not only in Montgomery County, but also throughout central Illinois.

His involvement in the region went far beyond his career. Roy was an active member of the Disciples of Christ in Hillsboro; a 45-year member of the Lions Club, where he had held all offices, the district lieutenant governor and district governor in 1991 and 1992; a member of the Mt. Moriah Masonic Lodge Number 51 A.F. & A.M. in Hillsboro; president of the Circuit Clerk's Association; a member of the Hillsboro Moose Lodge Number 1377; part of the Hillsboro Sports Association; and served as chairman, until his death, of the Montgomery County Board.

Roy also served as a coach for both youth baseball and soccer leagues, and was a dedicated fan and supporter of every sports team that his son played on and every child played on in Hillsboro, Illinois. He was especially fond of the Hillsboro Junior High Dragons that his son started on, clear up until his son played for the Gateway Grizzlies.

My thoughts and prayers are with Nanci and the rest of Roy's family and friends, as central Illinois has lost a leader whose presence will be tremendously missed.

REFORM OUR BROKEN MILITARY JUSTICE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 7 years, I have spoken out against the broken military justice system that allows commanders to decide how sexual assaults and other criminal offenses are prosecuted under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Our servicemembers are stuck in a world where their fates rest within the chain of command, where bias is king and justice often a jester.

Today, I stand here sick at heart that, once again, a rape conviction has been overturned because of the broken military justice system. In this instance, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces threw out Airman Rodney Boyce's rape and assault conviction because of the involvement of Lieutenant General Craig Franklin, who referred the case to court-martial.

This all came about because, in 2013, General Franklin was admonished by his superiors for tossing out the aggravated sexual assault conviction of a fellow F–16 pilot, a unanimous decision by a jury of his peers. Certainly, a general should not have the power to overturn the findings of a court of law simply because he thinks his buddy could not possibly have committed the sexual assault.

But because Franklin was appropriately admonished for this abuse of power, the U.S. Court of Appeals found that his subsequent decision to move forward with an entirely separate Boyce case constituted unlawful command influence.

This is made more ridiculous by two facts: first, the military judge during the actual trial found no evidence of unlawful command influence; second, the appeals court that threw out the Boyce case also did not find evidence of unlawful command influence, just the ''appearance'' of it.

So, apparently, unlawful command influence is like pornography: there is no definition, but judges know it when they see it.

Colleagues, it is past time to reform this unjust system that ignores jury decisions on the whim of a convening authority. The military must remove the power to decide whether or not to prosecute sexual assault cases from the chain of command and give the authority to independent military prosecutors.

I have met with countless survivors who have suffered in unique and horrifying ways. There is a hauntingly clear pattern to nearly all of their experiences: the perpetrator was let off the hook and the victim fellow servicemember was revictimized by an unjust system, all at the hands of the chain of command that is supposed to be there to protect and defend them.

The sense of betrayal by their command is marrow deep and life altering. Many describe the feelings of this betrayal more akin to a violation at the hands of a family member rather than a boss or coworker.

All that we need to do is to allow trained and experienced lawyers in the military to make a legal judgment about a crime. This in no way impacts the commander's authority. It simply gives servicemembers what we civilians take for granted, which is relying on a trained prosecutor to decide whether to move forward with serious charges of sexual assault.

Our servicemembers deserve and need a system that they can trust to be fair and impartial. Letting a convicted rapist walk free because of a mere appearance of unlawful command influence—forget the fact that he was, in fact, convicted of the assault—shows just how deep the problem runs.

As this case shows, the perception and the reality is that commanders with a built-in conflict of interest and with little or no legal training are deciding whether to move forward to trial. They make this decision not solely based on legal reasoning, but a myriad of other factors—like how well they fly a jet or how well they are liked by others—that should not be injected into the decisionmaking.

Our servicemembers deserve and need a system that they can trust to be fair and impartial. We have the power and duty to fundamentally reform the system to ensure that they are treated with a level of fairness that befits their sacrifice and service.

Mr. Speaker, the words of one military servicemember still haunt me and ring in my ears, when she said to me:

> I joined the military to fight the enemy. I never thought that he would be right next to me.

HONORING THE AMERICAN FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an often overlooked and sometimes underappreciated American hero: the American farmer.

The American farmer has been working the land since before the founding

of this country. Early settlers quickly discovered that America is endowed with abundant natural resources, rich soil, and temperate conditions that provide a solid foundation for a vibrant agrarian economy.

Fast-forward a few hundred years, and today the United States is the number one exporter of agricultural products in the world. In fact, farming accounts for over $163 billion each year. This production not only helps make our GDP the highest in the world, but it also helps feed billions worldwide, often in the most hard-to-reach places where food insecurity and malnutrition are chronic problems.

According to the most recent data from the USDA, family farms account for 99 percent of all farms in the U.S. and 89 percent of America's agricultural production. Ninety percent of the farms in the U.S. are considered small, and these small farms account for the vast majority of American farmers. This is equally true in Indiana, where, although we are the 38th largest State geographically, we rank in the top 10 in total agricultural sales.

Production in Indiana supports over 245,000 jobs, and corn, soybeans, hogs, poultry, and dairy have a combined $10 billion economic impact statewide. Simply put, ag is a really big deal in Indiana, and the Hoosier farmer does all of the heavy lifting.

Safe, affordable food is important to our national security, and a reliable, sustainable food source is crucial to safeguarding public health while preserving economic independence. That is why we should support our Nation's agricultural producers in every way that we can.

□ 1045

This includes supporting the U.S. crop insurance program, which provides an important safety net to farmers who assume major risks with each seed that they put in the ground. As recent natural disasters have made all too clear, widespread weather events can trigger huge losses for America's family farmers.

Without a national reinsurance pool, growers would have far fewer options available, many crops would be excluded, few could participate in the program, and growers would be forced to turn to Congress for assistance whenever disaster struck. That would be particularly true in areas where droughts and floods are common.

Through the crop insurance program, insurers can extend coverage to crops of all kind, providing farmers with the protections they need to do what they do best: grow food. This program is an example of the government partnering with industry to offer an exceptionally valuable service while maintaining a carefully limited Federal Government role. Frankly, it should be used as a model for other Federal reinsurance programs.

It is a success story, and even if you are not a farmer, you have benefited from its existence. It has helped you receive more affordable food and helped America maintain its agricultural preeminence. That is a great result for virtually every American.

Mr. Speaker, as Congress begins working on the next farm bill, I hope my colleagues recognize the value of our Federal crop insurance program and the important role that it plays in supporting the American farmer while he or she supports the American consumer.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK AND THE EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, I spent our congressional recess in the Rocky Mountain National Park, home to some of America's most unique and breathtaking natural wonders, in an attempt to better understand the mounting impacts climate change has on our national parks and all of our public lands across the country.

More than 4.5 million people from across America and the world visit the Rockies every year to take in the snowcapped peaks, the winding rivers, and the endless evergreen forests. They see herds of elk and bighorn sheep, and hear the screeching call of the mountain pika, a small furry creature that I can personally attest makes one of the most distinctive sounds in the mountains.

Visitors to the park, like me, can experience all four seasons in an hour as they drive up Trail Ridge Road from the sunny, low-elevation valleys, to the top of 12,000-foot peaks covered in 20-foot snowdrifts. It is impossible not to appreciate the intricate balance of nature while standing in that environment, the way that each species is finely tuned to survive in its surroundings and the way that each depends on the other.

Unfortunately, this careful balance is being shaken to its very core by manmade climate change as well as the denial of its existence by a very small group of post-science, post-research skeptics.

For centuries, bark beetles and lodgepole pines maintained a special relationship. Beetles, held in check by deep, cold winters, ate and killed some of the largest and oldest trees, opening up valuable forest real estate for new, younger trees to thrive. Now, however, thanks to warming global temperatures, those cold winters haven't come and beetle populations have boomed, killing literally millions of trees in the Rocky Mountains.

Formerly green mountainsides are dotted, or even dominated, by the silver skeletons of pines, it is one of the most conspicuous changes to visitors of the park.

The little pika is another of many species whose way of life is disappearing as global warming drives temperatures higher and higher. As summer temperatures spike, many of these creatures are dying out. Humans are not immune to these impacts either.

Warming winters cause more and more of the mountain's precipitation to fall as rain instead of snow, allowing it to run off or soak into the soil. The snowpack, which for generations has fed the Colorado River, is diminishing and, with it, our reliable and already taxed water source for seven Western States.

It was uncanny, Mr. Speaker, to be standing at the headwaters of the Colorado River, a mere creek in the Rockies, learning about the ways manmade warming is changing the world around us at the same time the President was withdrawing the United States from the historic Paris Agreement.

It was tragic irony to be in that environment to hear this devastating announcement. It was truly inexplicable to be surrounded by one of many national treasures as our Federal Government announced their decision to abandon them when they are needed most.

The agreement, an unprecedented show of global will to tackle a truly global problem, isn't an end-all, as some less-enlightened critics have said. It is a framework, a roadmap to get the pollution reductions started, to ensure a safe, sustainable, and economically prosperous future. It supports an economic model built for the long haul, one that protects lives and livelihoods, while wasting less and producing more. These are irrefutable costs to leaving the Paris Agreement.

By removing us from the agreement, the President isn't canceling it. He is simply ensuring that we are the ones who will be left behind as the world moves forward without us. We will be left behind with the cost of polluted air, preventable and expensive illness, and shrinking, uncompetitive fossil fuel industries that imperil their workers and drag the economy down.

It will cost us standing as a world leader in innovation as other countries step forward to fill the void that we have created and realize the benefits of clean-energy jobs, reliable public transit, and stable supply chains for businesses.

They understand that climate change affects us all, no matter our income or whether we are in the middle of a major city or on the top of the great Rocky Mountains.

The 194 nations that remain in the Paris Agreement will continue to act, not because the U.S. once told them to do so, but because it is the right thing to do and it is in their best interest from economic gain and public health to national security and stewardship.

I encourage everyone to go visit the mountains. Go spend a week with the incredible men and women of the National Park Service who have dedicated their lives to understanding and protecting America's precious natural

places. Then come back here, and I guarantee that you will understand why we need to act.

INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we are told that this week is Infrastructure Week. After four contentious months of a new President, and all that has been contained in those 4 months, I actually saw a glimmer of hope and possibility around the idea that we might finally come together to do something for our constituents in an area that they tell us is absolutely essential.

I worry, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to let this opportunity be lost in the political roil that is already consuming this idea of a week that we devote to infrastructure.

So I want to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and say, let's not let this idea go. It is too important. The improvement of our roadways and our bridges, our airports, and our railways is absolutely essential to the quality of life of every single constituent of every single Member of this House.

As I talk to the business leaders in my district, the fact that they have a challenge in moving their people and their goods, that sometimes getting to work is a 2-hour proposition, are the things that hold them back.

I know that the Republicans and the Democrats disagree on an awful lot, but we have to be able to agree on the fundamental notion that if we don't have a functioning transportation infrastructure, if our airplanes and ships and rails and cars don't move well, this country cannot be great, and our economy will be damaged.

These last 4 months have been pretty rough. We got—kicked off with a repeal of the Affordable Care Act; and I understand that my Republican friends had been promising that for years, but it was a brutal experience. It failed on the floor. The American public hates the bill that so many of my Republican friends were cajoled into voting for, much to their political peril.

There was an alternative start to this Presidency. There was this fantasy alternative start that has the President, shortly after his inauguration, saying to the American people: I know that this campaign was tough and the rhetoric was as ugly as it ever has been in an American campaign, but we are going to come together now, in January of 2017, to restitch the Nation, literally and figuratively. Literally means we are going to work together to rebuild the infrastructure of this country.

Sadly, that is an alternate reality that did not happen, and so we are consumed in Twitter feuds and partisanship and some of the most difficult to pass legislation that ultimately is not likely to become law, but which will continue to split the parties in this Chamber.

It is not too late, though, Mr. Speaker. I think we can still turn this around.

I have the privilege of chairing the New Democrat Coalition, 61 Democratic Members who, as challenged as they feel by this President's positions and behavior, are hoping for that moment when we can work with Republicans, when we can get something done with this President that will be meaningful to our constituents. And I know they, and many other Democrats, will be there for that conversation.

To my conservative, even to my Freedom Caucus friends, there is nothing more conservative than the idea that you keep your house in order; that you invest so that your children can have the kind of prosperity that we were able to experience.

And to the President, I would say: Sir, you seem to be a builder. You seem to have recognized the need for this kind of program when you promised a $1 trillion infrastructure investment. And, sir, I would say, if you look at some of our highways that were built in the 1950s, at the entrance ramp to those highways you will see a sign that says the Dwight D. Eisenhower Interstate Highway System. Sir, there is no reason why those signs couldn't have your name on them.

So, Mr. Speaker, this problem is so urgent, it is so potentially bipartisan in its solution, that I want to close with the observation that we need to lift this out of the partisan maw and observe, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday we celebrated the Greatest Generation because, 73 years ago yesterday, they stormed the beaches of Normandy. That is part of why we call them the Greatest Generation. But the other part and the other reason we call them that is because they came back to America and they set aside their differences and they invested in projects like the Interstate Highway System that we all use every day. That is a big part of why we call them the Greatest Generation. They built our country.

And now that generation looks at us and they have a question, and that question is: What will you do with that legacy that we built for you?

Mr. Speaker, let's answer that question in a way that will make them proud.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

As we begin the 84th year since the heroic efforts of our troops and our allies on D-day, help us to be mindful of the freedoms we enjoy and must be vigilant in protecting.

Bless our allies throughout the world and all those who stand with us in confronting the dangers and evils of our time. In all things, may the United States continue to be a beacon of light and hope.

Bless the Members of this people's House. Give them the wisdom and patience to do the work of Congress even in times of complexity both at home and abroad.

God bless America, and help us all to be our best selves. May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PANETTA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT TRUMP IS COURAGEOUS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Donald Trump last week courageously announced the withdrawal of the United States from the unconstitutional Paris accords, an unconstitutional treaty comprised of burdensome regulations destroying

jobs. I am grateful for President Trump's vision to create jobs for Americans.

President Trump has been clear: his first priority is jobs. Sadly, job-destroying regulations from the Paris treaty would prevent American jobs while having no positive achievement for American families.

Additionally, the Paris Agreement constitutes a treaty, a treaty that should have been submitted for approval to the Senate. Instead, the former President unconstitutionally adopted the treaty by executive order.

The best way to achieve a cleaner environment is through limited government and free market economic growth, creating jobs—not Big Government mandates with higher taxes, destroying jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our sympathy to the citizens of London on the murderous terrorist attacks Saturday, as we cherish our shared heritage of D-Day to liberate Europe for freedom.

MEDICARE

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, a major western New York health insurance provider announced today that they are seeking an almost 50 percent increase in health insurance premiums next year. They cite rising medical and drug costs as reasons for seeking this increase.

Medicare is the most successful and popular healthcare system in America. With low administrative costs and high-quality outcomes, Americans ages 50 to 65 should be able to buy in, at their own expense, to Medicare. Under this plan, Medicare could add 10 million more Americans, using the leverage of 67 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this is real leverage to drive down healthcare costs and drive up the quality of that coverage. With real patient protections and full and affordable coverage for preexisting diseases like cancer and diabetes, Medicare should be an option for Americans 50 to 65 years old.

RECOGNIZING EMILY AND MICHAEL BROADBRIDGE

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about some incredible young people back home in Michigan. Meet Emily and Michael Broadbridge. Emily is a sixth grader and Michael is a first grader in Macomb County.

This is no ordinary lemonade stand. Instead of simply making money for themselves, Emily and Michael are donating all the money they earn to the Homeless Education Project, which provides school supplies and clothes for homeless students in Macomb County.

Emily held her first lemonade stand on National Lemonade Day in 2011—yes, there is one—when she was just 5. Her parents thought it would be a good lesson in entrepreneurship, but it became so much more when she decided on her own to donate her proceeds to charity. Since then, Emily and her brother, Michael, have raised over $13,000 for the Homeless Education Project. They expect to raise $7,000 this year.

Emily and Michael have selflessly put others' needs before their own. I am proud to recognize them and their example today as role models for our community.

''WRONG'' CHOICE ACT

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this week the House considers the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act, so I have one question for this body: Has this House completely forgotten how much pain the housing crisis that triggered the Great Recession has caused the American people?

Eleven million people lost their homes; 8 million Americans lost their jobs; people lost their life savings—and that was not some sort of an accident of history. It was the effect of bad policy that allowed financial institutions to prey upon unwitting customers and take everything that they have worked for. That is what precipitated this crisis. It wasn't a storm. It was bad policy.

And so what do we have? A bill that will take us right back to where we were, to the conditions that caused the financial crisis in the first place, and take the cop off the beat, essentially eliminating the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to protect people.

We cannot do this. Let's reject this bill.

SUPPORTING THE FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act, replacing the harmful Dodd-Frank Act, with reforms that help all Americans.

The CHOICE Act keeps the promise to my constituents to remove Obama-era regulations, increase choice for consumers in my community, and impose the toughest penalties in history for financial fraud.

Strong communities like the ones I represent in north Texas are based on the strength of their local businesses. Under Dodd-Frank, America loses an average of one community bank every day. The Financial CHOICE Act will help businesses on Main Street reform business on Wall Street and fuel economic growth throughout the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 10.

REMEMBERING JACK O'NEILL

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Jack O'Neill, a Santa Cruz resident, a cultural icon, and a surfing legend. Jack passed away last week at 94 years young. There has been a great amount of love for this man and a great amount of appreciation for what this man did.

After serving in the U.S. Navy, he moved to Santa Cruz, where he loved surfing in its cold waters, so much so that he was quoted as saying: ''When you get screwed up, just jump in the ocean and everything is all right.''

Jack's love for being in the ocean was demonstrated by being one of the first people to create and the first person to market the wetsuit. This led to him and millions of other people being able to surf at any time and at any temperature.

He was a trailblazer not just in the ocean, but in life. As a father of seven and grandfather of six, he understood how important it was to preserve our ocean for our children.

He was instrumental in designating Santa Cruz as a world surfing reserve, one of only four locations in the world that preserve surf spots and their surrounding environment.

He created the O'Neill Sea Odyssey, an educational program on a 65-foot-long catamaran that teaches our children how to be stewards of the ocean.

Jack not only bestowed upon us the wetsuit and year-round surfing, he left a legacy for our children to understand that being in and around the ocean really can make everything all right. For that, I thank and I honor Jack O'Neill.

THE BATTLE OF MIDWAY

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Chaplain mentioned, in his prayer a few minutes ago, D-day. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to honor the brave Americans who fought the most influential naval battle of World War II: the Battle of Midway.

This week marks 75 years since U.S. forces defeated the Japanese Imperial Navy, forever changing the course of history. Victory in this battle allowed the United States and its allies to go on offense for the duration of the war. This was a real turning point in World War II.

The Japanese came to the battle from June 4 to June 7, 1942, with the largest armada they had ever assembled and the intention to finally defeat

U.S. Naval forces in the Pacific. An American intelligence breakthrough cracked the Japanese fleet codes, allowing us to anticipate and to prepare for this attack.

With our mere three carriers to their many carriers, battleships, and cruisers, the odds of victory were not in our favor, a true underdog story. The land-based air supports that Midway Island allowed and our naval officers' uncanny ability to adapt and think on their feet led to our success and kept our country safe from the Axis powers.

I was very pleased to work with the late Senator Jesse Helms and the International Midway Memorial Foundation to pass legislation declaring Midway Island a national memorial so that it may be protected and forever serve to honor the American lives lost in the pursuit of victory in this war.

THE ''WRONG'' CHOICE ACT

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act. The Republicans would take us back to the good old days.

Remember the good old days? Enron, the collapse of Wall Street because of millions of bad mortgages and virtual collateralized debt obligations, and other schemes that pyramided the problem to a point where it caused the worst economic collapse since the Great Depression.

Now Goldman Sachs populates the White House. They run the Treasury. Now they want to deregulate Wall Street again with a so-called CHOICE Act.

Now, there are problems with over-regulation of the community banks and small banks; they didn't cause the problem. But they want to say, ''No, let's just deregulate everybody again,'' not targeting the problem. So they are going to repeal the Volcker Rule. They are going to do away with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

No more requiring lenders to be certain that people are borrowers who can repay their loans. No, the credit card companies, the payday lenders, the debt collectors, there are no abuses there. We don't need a watchdog overlooking them.

And then, finally, they do away with something called orderly liquidation authority. Back to the good old days when firms on Wall Street were too big to fail. We can't have in place a process that would allow us to remove overpaid executives who crash their firm and to make the stockholders pay instead of the taxpayers.

That is what this bill does today. It is the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act.

WITHDRAWING FROM PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, when President Trump withdrew from the Paris climate accord last week, I was in Germany meeting with some of that country's top officials, legislators, and business leaders. In our conversations, many of my German counterparts rightly emphasized that climate change is a major world threat, with potential to cause widespread and long-lasting damage if not acted upon.

So the news of President Trump's unilateral decision drew sharp criticism and deep concern. Our longtime allies viewed withdrawal as America ceding international leadership and turning its back on the world.

Indeed, withdrawing from the Paris climate accord reduces our ability to help shape a solution to the climate change crisis and retreats from our responsibility to serve as a global leader. It also ignores the role we, here in the United States, play in contributing to climate change.

I stand in strong support of American businesses and State and local leaders across our country who see beyond the shortsighted approach of this decision and will remain committed to furthering the goals of the Paris accord.

□ 1215

ROLLING BACK FINANCIAL REGULATIONS WILL PUT OUR COUNTRY'S ECONOMIC SECURITY AT RISK

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, rolling back financial regulations that are in place to protect the American people will put them and our country's economic security at risk. However, the Financial CHOICE Act that is being considered by Congress today does just that: it erodes protections against dishonest big bank practices that rob people of their hard-earned salaries.

This bill repeals the Volcker rule. It dismantles the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, strips regulations in place to protect the American people's savings, and actually lets the big banks maintain even less capital that they need to absorb catastrophic losses, making it so that they are relying once again on the American taxpayer to bail them out.

We don't need to remind the families who have suffered so much about the pain caused by the Great Recession. In my own home State of Hawaii, from 2008 to 2010, our unemployment rate more than doubled, and 11 million people in America lost their homes. The big banks of 2008 are even bigger and more powerful today.

I urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous bill and, instead, pass H.R. 790, the Return to Prudent Banking Act, which would reinstate a 21st century Glass-Steagall Act.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, our focus should be on education and job creation. We should invest in transportation and infrastructure; invest in research and development; invest in technology and innovation; and invest in working families, middle class folks, and senior citizens.

Instead, House Republicans have shortened the workweek and canceled votes on Friday.

Why?

Apparently because James Comey is testifying tomorrow and they want to get out of town before sundown. That is an abdication of responsibility, a dereliction of duty, and a classic example of legislative malpractice.

''Where are the jobs?'' the American people are asking. House Republicans are missing in action and the American people deserve better.

FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT WOULD BE A DISASTER FOR THE ENTIRE FINANCIAL SYSTEM

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 10, the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act.

This bill would take us back to the regulatory stone age and would be a disaster for our entire financial system. It would actually increase risk in the financial system because, under this bill, any bank that meets an arbitrary new 10 percent leverage ratio would be exempted from all other capital and liquidity requirements. The problem with the leverage ratio is that it treats all assets equally risky. Under the leverage ratio, a subprime mortgage-backed security is considered just as risky as a U.S. Treasury bond.

As a result, many banking regulators have pointed out that relying solely on the leverage ratio would give banks an incentive to get rid of their safest assets, like U.S. treasuries, and load up on riskier assets.

Incentives matter, Mr. Speaker, and this bill gives banks a huge incentive to load up on risk. We know what risk is like. Eleven million people lost their homes, and many lost their jobs. Let's not remove the safety net that was put in place with the Dodd-Frank bill.

I oppose the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act. It is bad for America, bad for people, and the wrong direction. I urge a strong ''no'' vote.

DEFEATING THE ISIS ENEMY

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand shoulder to shoulder with our friends and allies in Great Britain, who have suffered three horrific terror attacks in a period of less than 3 months.

These attacks at the hands of Islamic State in Iraq and Syria are barbaric, evil, and must be condemned by the entire world. These cowards have used vehicles, knives, and bombs to rein terror down on London and Manchester, even targeting innocent young girls at a concert hall.

Radical Islamic extremism is a vile ideology that must be stamped out at every corner of the world. This is a time for unity of purpose and strong leadership.

The United States, our NATO allies, and our allies in the Middle East must chart a unified course towards complete destruction of ISIS. As we begin to succeed in the fight, their resolve to attack us will only grow stronger, but we cannot be deterred.

Mr. Speaker, freedom and liberty must win over hatred and extremism. We must defeat this enemy, and this Congress stands ready to support this administration in its efforts to do so.

CONGRATULATING VIRGIN ISLAND STUDENTS

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the end of the school year for students. And, of course, that means graduation and promotion celebrations.

I want to congratulate all of our students on their achievements and their proud family members.

To our teachers, faculty, and staff, we thank you for your continued commitment to educating our children. We know that there are many challenges in today's learning environment, but amid the challenges we face, you stand strong. We appreciate all of your work.

As a representative in Congress for the Virgin Islands, I pledge to continue to support legislation and initiatives that make our children, teachers, and administrators a priority.

To the students of the U.S. Virgin Islands, I have a message for you: During these summer months, please take this time to continue to learn, participate in the Governor's reading challenge, find a new hobby, work, and please explore the natural wonder of our home, the Virgin Islands of the United States. Be safe, and best wishes to you all as you continue a productive educational journey. Have a safe and fun-filled summer.

AUTHORITY OF THE WHITE HOUSE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is often difficult when Members represent different aspects or parties to really speak to what is right.

I just came from Europe, meeting with Europeans from a number of countries. I was passing through London in the backdrop of the heinous and tragic London Bridge incident. Many of us saw the courageous mayor of London speak to the people, along with national leadership.

So I must indicate my disappointment in the comments of the Commander in Chief of this Nation to bash in time of trouble Mayor Khan, a Muslim, who has stood against terrorism. Then, of course, the precipitous actions of firing Director Comey and the rumors of either firing or asking for the resignation of Attorney General Sessions gives me great pause for legislation like the Financial CHOICE Act that would take away the independent authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and make the head of that an appointee of the President, so the person who protects consumers will be able to be fired by this President.

With the words against the London mayor, the firing of Comey, and the threatening of Attorney General Sessions, I wonder whether or not we can tolerate any other authority given to this White House to be able to fire people who are to protect the rights of the American people, and to be able to stand for comments that undermine our allies and the friendships that we have established over the decades working to secure the American people. Let us think about it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 7, 2017, at 9:17 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1094.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REAPPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4412, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development:

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN, New Mexico

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 374 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 374

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 374, which provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act, and makes in order one amendment.

H.R. 2213 is a commonsense, bipartisan bill, introduced by Ms. MCSALLY from Arizona, that will help ensure we have sufficient Border Patrol agents to secure our border. At this point in

time, where we are facing tremendous challenges overseas, where we are facing tremendous national security challenges, our Customs and Border Protection is understaffed and unable to meet the congressionally mandated staffing levels for Customs officers and Border Patrol agents.

With these ever-increasing threats to our national security, it is vital that we ensure CBP can quickly hire capable and trustworthy individuals to secure our border. Currently, prospective officers and Border Patrol agents are required to undergo a background check that includes passing a polygraph test. This process has been very long and has drastically delayed the CBP's ability to hire officers and Border Patrol agents.

H.R. 2213 simply provides a limited, voluntary exemption to the pre-employment polygraph requirement for State and local law enforcement officers that are in good standing and who have already passed a State and local law enforcement polygraph test, for Federal law enforcement officers who are in good standing, and members of the armed services or veterans who have received or who are eligible to receive an honorable discharge and have held a security clearance and undergone a thorough background check in the past 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this exemption is very narrow and only applies to men and women that we already trust to protect and defend us at home or abroad: men and women who have already been through relevant security background checks. The CBP would not be required to use this waiver authority; and, if there is anything in any applicant's history that warrants further investigation, the CBP Commissioner is fully authorized and encouraged to use a polygraph test to resolve any outstanding questions.

Mr. Speaker, for years, the CBP has struggled to recruit and vet potential employees. There is no more urgent need that we have right now than securing our border and making sure we have the resources there to be able to do that job.

□ 1230

H.R. 2213 is a commonsense approach that will help address this issue and ensure the CBP has the men and women it needs to keep our borders and our Nation secure. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 2213, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), my friend, for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

H.R. 2213 would broaden the criteria for waiving the polygraph requirements for certain applicants at U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

Under the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act, the Commissioner of the CBP would be permitted to waive polygraph requirements for certain State and law enforcement personnel who have passed a polygraph examination, Federal law enforcement agents who have passed a stringent background investigation, and veterans with three consecutive years in the military who have held a security clearance and passed a background check.

Mr. Speaker, we understand the importance of ensuring that our Federal law enforcement agencies are operating at full capacity, but there are other big-ticket items that we are ignoring in this institution. So I ask: Where is the Republican agenda?

With control of both Chambers of Congress and the White House, my colleagues across the aisle have made it through nearly half of their first year in power without a single major legislative achievement. It appears that President Donald John Trump is more interested in slashing old policies than proposing new ones.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump and congressional Republicans have yet to put forward the promised $1 trillion infrastructure package. Voters are still waiting for the massive tax cuts promised to them during the campaign.

The American people have yet to see a single jobs bill, let alone the super-secret plan to defeat ISIS. And looming over this long to-do list is the investigation into Russia's blatant attempts to interfere in our election, an issue that many of my Republican colleagues seem more than happy to ignore.

Instead, President Donald John Trump and my friends across the aisle have spent their time rolling back protections for workers, consumers, teachers, students, and the environment.

Instead of tackling a bipartisan spending deal, addressing budget cuts under sequestration, and avoiding debt default, the Republican-controlled Congress insists on dismantling the Affordable Care Act and replacing it with a plan that will raise deductibles, lessen coverage, and leave 23 million more people uninsured.

Mr. Speaker, there are still plenty of people without jobs in this country. We have plenty of families worried that they will be tossed off of their health insurance plan, and we have plenty of folks who are pleading with Congress to pass compassionate immigration reform.

Yet President Donald John Trump is tweeting about his travel ban and attacking London Mayor Sadiq Khan hours after a terrorist attack hit London which, sadly, killed seven people and injured dozens more.

Mr. Speaker, after being the antigovernment party—and I find it hypocritical that people in the administration are declaring that we are obstructionists. They gave, during that period of the previous President, obstruction absolutely new meaning. After being the antigovernment party for so many years, it appears that the congressional Republicans have forgotten how to govern.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I welcome the opportunity to share the floor today with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my good friend from the Rules Committee. I just would point out that, as a Congress, as a body, we have actually passed more pieces of legislation, gotten them on the President's desk, and gotten them signed at this point in Congress than at any time since President Truman was in office.

So it may be that my colleague is not in agreement with many of the things that we have done, but, Mr. Speaker, we have actually been working very hard to begin the process of recovery from 8 years of rules and regulations that have really strangled the people of this Nation.

We have passed, as the gentleman noted, healthcare reform out of this body. We repealed ObamaCare, and every single day we get more and more indication about the failures of that healthcare plan, with insurance companies pulling out of markets and leaving citizens all across this Nation unable to get access to affordable care. The Republican plan will change that.

We are also in the process and will, tomorrow, be voting to repeal the Dodd-Frank legislation, which has had a devastating effect on our community banks all across this country and on our communities, and moving away from the really misguided approach of the last 8 years that centralized power here in Washington, D.C.

One thing that didn't happen in the last 8 years though was the security of the border. And far too often we saw laws that weren't enforced. We saw people turning the other way for sanctuary cities, for example, and the failure on the part of the last administration to do what was necessary to make sure that we could know who is coming into this country and that we had the resources necessary to secure our border.

So I am very proud to be here today, to be able to debate this rule, to be able to debate the underlying legislation, which is sadly needed, so that we can get those resources we need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption and Reauthorization Act of 2017.

As someone who has spent their entire career and adult life in law enforcement, I know full well the importance of being able to hire quality men and women to provide for the security of our communities and our Nation at large.

H.R. 2213 simply provides the Border Patrol and U.S. Customs a tool in their

hiring toolkit to expedite the hiring of those who have already held some of our Nation's highest positions of public trust and who have already undergone the most thorough vetting available.

It allows Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have served in good standing for more than 3 years and who have undergone a polygraph exam to be eligible to have their CBP preemployment polygraph waived in order to expedite their hiring.

As a former sheriff who mandated—I mandated preemployment polygraphs in my own department. I have full confidence in thoroughness of the vetting conducted by State and local law enforcement agencies prior to hiring an officer. Those exams do not need to be duplicated by CBP in order to hire a prospective officer or agent who has already been vetted by their local department and has a proven track record of performance.

If CBP finds derogatory information on an applicant whose polygraph has been waived, then they still have the authority to conduct their standard CBP polygraph to determine whether that applicant should, in fact, be hired.

This bill does not lower standards. I want to say that again. This bill does not lower standards. It merely takes a commonsense approach to hiring by giving CBP the option not to duplicate a polygraph exam already completed by a highly qualified applicant's previous law enforcement agency.

I represent the Port of Jacksonville, which moved 82 tons of cargo last year and is one of only 16 ports of call authorized to move military cargo through our national security operations.

It is absolutely vital that U.S. Customs and Border Protection are able to hire enough quality officers to maintain the flow of commerce.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my good friend and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. The bill, in fact, does weaken critical screening of potential CBP officers, and our country actually should be working to increase the security relative to CBP. CBP is essential. It is our first line of defense to stop terrorists, to stop drugs, to stop dangerous persons coming in, and we should not weaken our standards.

Now, the overwhelming majority of CBP officers are honest, hardworking public servants. Crime and corruption has, however, been a persistent problem for the agency. Numerous CBP officers have been found to have strong connections to organized crime, including drug cartels. They are in prison now.

In many cases, cartels try and infiltrate the CBP by recruiting people to apply for CBP positions. This results in illicit drug smuggling and other dangerous activities.

In 2015, the CBP Integrity Advisory Panel found that—and this is a quote—''arrests for corruption of CBP personnel far exceed, on a per capita basis, such arrests at other Federal law enforcement agencies.''

In 2016, this same panel observed that ''corrupt CBP law enforcement personnel pose a national security threat.'' And it recommended that the current polygraph test be expanded, not reduced.

Now, this bill allows for an exemption for local law enforcement and former members of the Armed Forces from the polygraph requirement. For example, if a polygraph has been taken in the prior 10 years, I think it is a mistake to think that that will protect us.

In fact, the Inspector General at DHS, John Roth, advises against this bill. He explained that the polygraph changes, including this legislation—and this is a quote—''could put CBP at significant risk.''

He says: ''While it may sound reasonable to say you could waive requirements from former military personnel because they have passed a polygraph, Border Patrol agents work in a different environment that is not as controlled as the military.''

Now, it is important to note that, of the applicants for the CBP, two-thirds fail the polygraph test. That may be a concern, but we ought to be glad that people who are a risk are not actually hired by the CBP.

I will just note that the Government Accountability Office advises that, between 2005 and 2012, there were 2,170 reported incidents of arrest of CBP personnel for misconduct. That is about one arrest a day of CBP officials.

CBP's own Integrity Advisory Panel, and these are law enforcement experts, outside law enforcement experts, concluded in 2015 that ''there is data indicating that arrests for corruption of CBP personnel far exceed, on a per capita basis, such arrests at other Federal law enforcement agencies.'' And in its final report, that panel recommended that the current polygraph testing be expanded to include postemployment tests that are best practices at the FBI and agencies in the U.S. intelligence service.

Now, I will just give you some examples that are real life examples from CBP, and this is from the agency itself. These are individuals who could be exempted.

An officer who, when faced with a polygraph, admitted possession of approximately 100 videos and 10,000 still images of child pornography.

A police officer who admitted to sexual assault.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LOFGREN. An Afghan veteran who had classified information that he admitted he had taken out of theater.

An Army officer who would meet the criteria who admitted that he had removed classified information from Iraq.

A police officer who admitted that he had smuggled marijuana into detention centers.

It is not too big a burden to ask that applicants have a polygraph test and be clean.

□ 1245

The Sinaloa cartel is recruiting people to apply to become CBP officers. Our protection is to make sure that we completely screen every single applicant so that the cartel is unsuccessful in infiltrating our first line of defense at the U.S. borders.

So, with that, I know that the authors are well-intentioned, but this is a serious mistake for the security of our country, and I urge Members to vote against the bill.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Rules Committee colleague for yielding. I am proud to support this rule and the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, last November, the American people sent a strong message: They want a secure southern border. Having a strong system of border security is critical to our national defense and the safety and the security of the American people. President Trump has asked us to get more boots on the ground protecting our border, and this bill is an important step in that process.

U.S. Border Patrol agencies are the ones serving on the front lines when it comes to border security. These hardworking men and women serve day at night at the border, at airports, and at sea and land ports in an effort to keep us safe. We should be grateful for their service and their sacrifice.

Unfortunately, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or CBP, is woefully understaffed. In fact, the numbers show that we are short 1,000 officers and 1,800 Border Patrol agents. This shortage is making it harder to secure the border and help keep bad actors out of our country.

That is where this bill comes in. It would amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to provide necessary discretionary waiver authority to the CBP Commissioner in an effort to reduce the staffing shortage. The bill specifically would provide the Commissioner with the authority to waive the polygraph examinations in three circumstances.

The polygraph exam would be waived for current State and local law enforcement officers who have already passed a polygraph examination, Federal law enforcement officers who have already passed a stringent background investigation, and veterans with at least 3 consecutive years in the military who have held a clearance and passed a background check. These are three very tailored and specific circumstances, and these are exactly the

kind of men and women we want and need when it comes to border security positions.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the waiver authority granted under this bill is not mandatory. It will ultimately be the decision of the CBP Commissioner to decide on a strict case-by-case basis whether to issue a waiver. The Commissioner can order a polygraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner can still order a polygraph for any applicant they deem necessary.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that passed out of the Homeland Security Committee on a voice vote, and I hope to see more bipartisan support here in the full House.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting a stronger and more robust border security system.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to be deeply concerned by revelations that Russia hacked last year's elections. In fact, just this week we learned that Russian military intelligence engaged in a monthlong cyber attack against our voting infrastructure, specifically targeting a voting software supplier and 122 local election officials.

This most recent revelation comes on the back of earlier determinations by the intelligence community that Russia hacked the DNC and distributed fake news in order to sway the election in Donald Trump's favor. This has been made even more troublesome by the fact that Donald John Trump recently admitted that he fired FBI Director Comey over the Bureau's investigation into links between the Trump campaign and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the integrity of our electoral system is at stake. It is time the Republican-controlled Congress does its job and acts to defend our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan bill, H.R. 356, which would create a nonpartisan commission to investigate Russian interference into our 2016 election.

This marks the eighth time we have tried to bring this bill to the House floor. On the previous seven occasions, the Republican majority, regrettably, refused to allow the House to even debate this important legislation. But today, they will have yet another opportunity to redeem themselves. I hope they will finally put country ahead of party.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, we stand here today with a to-do list a mile long, and we don't have much time to cross items off that list. There are only 30 working days before our 5-week August recess. That is not much time, but those of us on this side of the aisle stand ready to work in a bipartisan manner with our Republican colleagues in order to make sensible reforms to our Tax Code, our infrastructure and healthcare system, in short, to work hard for the American people, because that is what we were sent here to do.

It is far past time for my friends across the aisle to come to the table ready to work on behalf of the American people in a bipartisan manner. We on this side of the aisle continue to stand ready to do so, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for his participation in this debate today.

I think it is important for the record to be clear and to be accurate, Mr. Speaker. This House of Representatives, in the time that we have been in session, has been the most productive House during the first 100 days of a Presidency in 30 years.

I am sure that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may not want to agree to that. They may not want to acknowledge that because Speaker PELOSI held the record previously when she was Speaker, but I am very proud of that, that we have done a tremendous amount for the American people in the time that we have been in session.

We have overturned 14 Obama regulations in this Congress alone, which has had a tremendous impact on our constituents. We have already taken steps that will save them $3.7 billion in regulatory costs, 4.2 million hours in paperwork.

Mr. Speaker, when I think about the communities across my home State of Wyoming, this relief could not have come soon enough. We are in a position today where we have faced strangling regulation out of Washington, D.C., for the last 8 years, regulation that was truly intended in too many instances to drive businesses out of business, to drive our community banks out of business, and to create a situation where Washington, D.C., was creating one-size-fits-all policies. But those days are over. This is a new day, and we take very seriously our obligations to put country ahead of party.

With respect to Russia, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague is well aware, there are multiple investigations underway in the Congress. We on the Republican side—I think this is a bipartisan issue—take very seriously the sanctity of our electoral process and will make sure that we get to the bottom of it.

We have got to ensure that we recognize and understand the extent to which Russian hacking was going on—frankly, not just in the United States, but around the world—and make sure that we do everything necessary to stand up against both Russian hacking, to stand up against the kind of Russian attacks that we are seeing on electoral processes in Europe, and, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we secure ourselves.

At the end of the day, that is what this debate is about here this afternoon. We have got to make sure that we all recognize in this body that there is nothing more important than the security of our Nation.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we are at a crisis moment. We are at a crisis because, for the last 8 years, our military has been strangled. For the last 8 years, our borders weren't secure. We have had threats growing around the world.

We have seen the rise of ISIS. We have seen the rise of al-Qaida—the expansion of al-Qaida around the world into many more countries than it ever existed before.

We have seen the Iranians make steady progress towards obtaining a nuclear weapon under what is the most misguided treaty agreement ever entered into by any American President: the Iranian nuclear agreement.

We have seen Chinese aggression in the South China Sea. We have seen Russian aggression in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen North Korea attempting, on a near weekly basis it sometimes seems, to make sure that it has perfected and acquired ballistic missile technology, while they also work to make sure that they are able to put a nuclear warhead on those ballistic missiles.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in a very dangerous world. We are living in a world in which America's ability to defend and protect itself is under threat in a way that it has not been certainly since the end of the Cold War, and maybe even since World War II.

Defending and protecting this Nation, Mr. Speaker, will require, both, that we provide the resources our military needs to defend us so that we can, Mr. Speaker, get out from underneath the policies of the last 8 years, but it also will require that we secure our border.

This bill today on the floor will provide the relief necessary for the CBP to do what is necessary to keep us safe. We have no greater responsibility than providing for our security.

I would remind the gentleman from Florida that this bill passed out of the Homeland Security Committee on a voice vote, on a bipartisan basis, with sponsors from both sides of the aisle. It is crucially important that we take this step to provide the relief—and not mandatory relief, but the relief—that the CBP can use if it needs.

Mr. Speaker, as we discuss the range of accomplishments that we have had that I am very proud of in this Congress and the accomplishments still to come, I think that we have to also recognize that nothing is more important than the security of the Nation. This bill goes to the heart of that, to making sure that the CBP can do its job. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of both the rule and H.R. 2213.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 374 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 356) to establish the National Commission on Foreign Interference in the 2016 Election. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 356.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1300

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 375 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 375

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWEIKERT). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. This rule provides a

structured process for debate and makes in order six amendments to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to return hope and opportunity to Main Street America through the Financial CHOICE Act. This legislation touches at the very heart of our economy, ensuring that our financial system facilitates job creation, economic growth, and fairness.

Nearly 10 years ago, the American economy cratered. The Great Recession of the late 2000s revealed that our financial system was fragile, and many Americans got the short end of the stick.

In 2010, Democrats passed H.R. 4173, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. They promised the bill would lift the American economy. They promised an end to Wall Street bailouts. They promised to protect consumers. Seven years later, we know that these promises never came true.

Due to Dodd-Frank's excessive regulatory burden, big banks are getting bigger while small banks and credit unions are disappearing. There have only been six new bank charters since Dodd-Frank—a drastic decline from the 170 on average per year before the bill. In fact, 43 percent of banks with assets under $100 million have disappeared.

Large banks survive because they can afford armies of lawyers to understand Dodd-Frank regulations. In 2010, Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein even suggested his bank would be among the biggest beneficiaries of Dodd-Frank. But for community banks with community budgets, the effects of the law have been devastating.

Dodd-Frank also failed to address the too-big-to-fail problem. Under the Dodd-Frank law, big banks are growing larger, and taxpayers are still responsible for bailing them out. Furthermore, Dodd-Frank has made access to banking and credit more difficult for average Americans. Since the passage of the bill, bank fees have increased and millions more Americans are now considered unbanked or underbanked.

Declining liquidity has limited access to credit for small businesses and the regulatory restrictions on mortgages have pushed homeownership out of reach for the middle class. Seventy-two percent of community banks say that the Dodd-Frank regulations restrict their ability to offer mortgage loans.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the price we must pay to be a hopeful and prosperous nation. That is why I am here supporting the Financial CHOICE Act. It repeals Dodd-Frank, replacing the harmful law with reasonable regulations that ensure consumer protection, job growth, economic growth, and strong community banks.

The Financial CHOICE Act ends the coddling of big banks. It implements historically tough penalties on financial fraud and insider trading. It ends taxpayer-funded bailouts and creates new bankruptcy laws designed for failing banks. It is time that Congress put Main Street ahead of Wall Street.

The Financial CHOICE Act also reins in the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, a government agency that has incredible power to regulate the financial industry but that has nearly no accountability. The judicial branch has actually declared its structure unconstitutional.

The CFPB is causing problems for consumers. They have a database for complaints from consumers, but it publishes consumer complaints before even checking if they are true. The CFPB also weighs in on financial regulations where Congress should instead be making these decisions, and the CFPB wasted over $200 million on lavish renovations of their office space in downtown Washington, D.C.

This legislation we are considering today will restructure the CFPB, restoring congressional oversight duties and moving the agency back under the regular legislative appropriations process. We will also be refocusing the CFPB on enforcing consumer protection laws, rather than making up their own laws that only hurt the average American consumer.

Perhaps most important to Coloradans, the Financial CHOICE Act creates economic growth and jobs by making credit easier to access for Main Street America. Thanks to the TAILOR Act, introduced by my friend and colleague from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), regulators will be able to craft custom regulations to reflect the specific business model of local banks.

This bill also creates jobs and economic growth by requiring more transparent policymaking at the Federal Reserve. We rein in stifling regulations on small, community banks, allowing them to compete against their larger counterparts. We increase consumer choice by ensuring Americans can access a bank and a credit card.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today to transform our Nation's financial system. We have the opportunity to level the playing field between big and small banks. We have the opportunity to turn up the heat on financial fraud. We have the opportunity to return regulatory power from the hands of unelected bureaucrats to the people. We have the opportunity to roll back hurtful regulations.

We are here to restore hope and opportunity through the Financial CHOICE Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, I brought the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to the floor of the House as chairwoman of the House Rules Committee. This law was a statement from Congress on behalf of the American people that unchecked corporate greed will never again bring the United States of America to financial collapse.

My colleague began his speech this morning by saying that this law had not worked, but I am not aware of major bank failures or bank failures of any kind since we passed it, and I would say, indeed, this law has worked.

Since it has been enacted, our economy has had over 80 consecutive months of private sector job growth. That is pretty good. In fact, it is a record-setting streak. More than 16 million jobs have been created, and business lending has been increased by 75 percent. I am not getting all the complaints that I used to get that they could not borrow money from banks, particularly the small businesses.

Along the way, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau established under this law has helped 29 million people in all of our 50 States to receive nearly $12 billion in relief from companies that engaged in irresponsible or predatory practices.

One group that sent us a letter begging us not to do away with Dodd-Frank was the Veterans of Foreign Wars who said that far too often their veterans were the victims of predatory lenders—shysters, people not telling them the truth—and that is exactly what the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was established to do.

You can't argue about whether or not it has been a success if 29 million people in 50 States have gotten back $12 billion in relief of bad practices. But this legislation completely will do away with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the only thing we have left to protect Main Street and the small investors.

These gains weren't a coincidence, Mr. Speaker. They were the result of the Dodd-Frank law. Gutting Wall Street reform will be a historic giveaway to special interests.

□ 1315

The Wall Street firms who plunged our country to the brink, in 2008, would be free once again to take advantage of consumers and force middle class families to go it alone, without the protections this bill has provided them.

The CHOICE Act is the wrong choice for consumers and families. Instead of standing with financial lobbyists, I urge the majority to uphold the trust of the people we all represent.

Five years ago, Democrats and Republicans came together to almost unanimously pass my bill to end insider trading in Congress. The STOCK Act passed this Chamber by a vote of 417–2, one of the most bipartisan bills of that entire session of Congress.

It wasn't easy. I led a 6-year fight to get it signed into law after learning that Members of Congress and their staffs were abusing their positions by making money from the information that they gleaned and that was not available to everybody else in America. They gleaned this information while

working on behalf of the people whose information they were stealing. It took a ''60 Minutes'' investigation on television and a groundswell of public support, but the bill became a reality.

For me, upholding the people's trust is the most sacred responsibility I have as a Member of Congress. That is why I am waging a new battle to strengthen the STOCK Act, after learning that some in this Congress have used legal loopholes to get around this law.

Once again, we see the importance of investigative journalism and a free press, which has shined a light on the fact that some Members of Congress have purchased private, discounted stock deals and taken a part in initial public offerings outside of the United States. These special deals are not available to the general public.

All this would have remained in the dark, had the STOCK Act not put into place a new requirement to timely disclose sales and purchases of stock. This is precisely the kind of outrageous conduct we intended to outlaw under the STOCK Act. It plays directly into the public's most cynical view of Congress.

This, Mr. Speaker, comes at a time when just 20 percent of the public approves of how Congress is doing its job under the majority's leadership. That is according to the latest figures from Gallup.

This Chamber put aside partisanship and took a strong, bipartisan stand against this abhorrent behavior just a few years ago. It has become increasingly clear that we need to act again today to hold ourselves accountable to both the letter and the spirit of the STOCK Act law.

We are not doing that today. Once again, we are taking away the regulations because some people find them so terribly abhorrent, but they protect the small investor and the people in the banks. We surely will never, I hope, see the day where we will ask the taxpayers of the United States to bail out the enormously rich, big banks. One of the worst things of that whole era was not a single fraudulent banker went to jail.

Just 535 of us in a country of more than 300 million people have been chosen to serve on the American people's behalf in Congress. It is a sacred responsibility, one we should not be squandering, doing the bidding of the financial lobbyists or Wall Street firms, who are the ones behind the CHOICE Act.

The majority should stop fulfilling the wish list of Wall Street and act on behalf of millions of Americans outraged by insider trading and other chicanery that still permeates the halls of Congress today. This Chamber must take action so that Americans recognize we came here to represent them, not enrich ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule because it is time to, once and for all, end the harmful regulations caused by this disastrous law.

Mr. Speaker, let me take just a few moments to talk to you about the harmful effects Dodd-Frank has had on my home State of Texas. As of just a few months ago, in Texas alone, 358 State or federally chartered banks, credit unions, or thrifts have either closed or merged since 2010, when Dodd-Frank became law.

According to our Texas State Banking Commission, the last bank or credit union chartered in Texas was in 2009, in a State with one of the healthiest economies in the country. Mass consolidations and closures have left many Texans few options, something the previous administration promised.

While Dodd-Frank aimed at fixing our recovering financial system, one-size-fits-all regulations have only hurt one person: the consumer. Increased bank fees, less access to consumer credit products, 1,000-page rules, and billions of dollars in regulatory costs all have become the hallmark of our financial system over the last 7 years.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, I will leave you with this: If you support crushing regulations that have hurt our community banks and our credit unions, if you support taxpayer bailouts, if you support an agency that is accountable to none, and if you support less accountability for both Washington and Wall Street, would you please vote against this rule and the underlying bill?

But if you support financial opportunity for all, taxpayer bailout for none, less regulations on small community financial institutions, and more accountability and transparency, then support this bill, support consumers, and support Main Street America.

In God we trust.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, those wondering why Republican lips are sealed so very tight when it comes to President Trump jeopardizing our national security, threatening our democracy, and engaging in one crazy action after another need look no further than this bill.

You see, this is a bill to handcuff the cop on Wall Street. So many of our Republican colleagues are so eager to shield Wall Street from action and eventually to bestow one tax break after another on Wall Street, that they are willing to pay almost any price in silence concerning Mr. Trump's outrages.

As a person who voted against all of the big bank bailouts, I am most concerned that this bill will produce only more. When the banks were bailed out, American families paid the price, as taxpayers. They paid the price for the recklessness that led to that unnecessary financial crisis.

A more immediate concern is what happens to the cop on the beat, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, a new law enforcement agency that the AARP described as one designed to hold scam artists accountable. That is exactly what the CFPB has done. Whether it is payday lenders or deceitful language in the fine print of financial agreements, reverse mortgages, contracts denying consumers their legal remedies to address wrongdoing, or many other issues, this agency has been there to protect the consumers.

Among those most threatened that have benefited from this law enforcement agency are our military families, who face unique financial challenges, from illegal foreclosures, to cheating them on student loans, to payday lenders who overcharge their families. This law enforcement agency has been there to protect them. Today, it would be substantially weakened by this legislation.

One of the leading examples of the success of this law enforcement agency is Wells Fargo: fined $100 million, $85 million in restitution, $75 million in claw-backs from executives, a CEO resigned. None of that happened to the other banks, but Wells Fargo was caught. It was caught because there was a law enforcement agency on the beat doing something about it.

There are those who fought this legislation from the start, and they won't give up on trying to undermine it.

You need only look at what happened this year in enforcement actions to see what this agency is doing: a company failed to provide redress for illegal collection tactics, deceived consumers about credit scores, misstated the charges associated with pawn loans, denied consumers access to their own money, and kept borrowers in the dark about options to avoid foreclosure. One bit of wrongdoing after another. Why not have a cop on the beat working for us? Some people want to have the unlimited right to exploit consumers. This agency is the one thing standing in the way to protect them.

I say: stop this Republican interference with law enforcement and send a message at the same time to President Donald J. Trump that our laws apply to him too, and ought to be enforced against him when he is engaged in wrongdoing.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most deceptive things that Congress does is regulate one part of an industry for the problems created by another part.

The community banks had nothing to do with the collapse in 2008. It was Wall Street, the people in New York, the big banks. Yet the Dodd-Frank regulation kind of let them scoot by and

gave them permits to continue operating, while many of the Main Street businesses and many of the Main Street banks have closed down.

My friend just mentioned Wells Fargo. CFPB stood on the sidelines silently and mute while they were conducting their affairs. It was a county prosecutor who actually uncovered it.

So this idea that we here in Congress are going to do things that are going to get it in check simply is not true. What is true is that the agency created by Dodd-Frank, the CFPB, or the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, was so annoying that it put New Mexico's most sparsely populated county, with about 8 people per square mile, to be regulated the same as New York City. That is how much CFPB understood.

In the process of their regulating, they shut down the loans for manufactured housing. That means nothing to the people in New York, but in New Mexico, that is 50 percent of the homes in my district. The CFPB didn't much care.

They also limited the ability of regular banks to make loans on mortgages, establishing something called qualified mortgages. They simply said all balloon notes are prejudicial. Those things were hurting and penalizing the rural parts of this country. The people who suffered most were the people at the lowest end of the economic spectrum.

Our credit agencies, our credit system in the U.S., has done much in order to make credit available, no matter where you are in the political and income spectrum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PEARCE. The people at the low end of the spectrum had access to many different ways of borrowing. CFPB simply routinely eliminated almost every single one of them.

As a representative of one of the poorest districts in the country, I have found CFPB's efforts to be meaningless to the big guys and punitive to us who are just trying to make a living out in the rural parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule and support for the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) the distinguished ranking member of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 10, the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act.

This bill will take us back to the regulatory stone age and would be a disaster for the entire financial system.

Let us remember why we passed Dodd-Frank: we confronted the worst financial crisis, caused by mismanagement from the financial industry, that cost this country $18 trillion in household wealth, millions lost their homes, millions lost their jobs, and the suffering was deep and strong.

First, this bill, the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act, would repeal the orderly liquidation authority, which is the only tool that would allow large financial institutions like Lehman Brothers or AIG to be wound down safely, without requiring a taxpayer bailout or causing a financial panic, like Lehman.

We had two choices in the crisis: either bail them out—a bad choice—or let them fail—another bad choice.

The liquidation authority is helpful, yet the majority claims that the liquidation authority codifies taxpayer bailouts. Nothing could be further from the truth. Under the liquidation authority, the FDIC wipes out the firm's shareholders, imposes losses on the firm's creditors, fires the firm's management, and completely liquidates the entire firm. The only people who are guaranteed not to suffer losses are the taxpayers.

So if we wipe out this protection to the taxpayers, we are putting the taxpayers in harm's way yet again.

□ 1330

This bill would also devastate investors by rolling back decades of investor protections and trampling on the property rights of shareholders by making it virtually impossible for them to influence the management of the companies that they own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Finally, the bill would completely gut the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which has been an incredible, effective watchdog for consumers and has protected the consumers who were often not thought about first of all or second of all—or not thought about at all. This agency protects them. If we would have had it, we would not have had the financial crisis we suffered. This would just make it easier for banks like Wells Fargo to rip off consumers and would protect them from being punished if they are caught.

So I want to point out that the Republican ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act puts Wall Street ahead of Main Street, leads to taxpayer bailouts for big banks, guts consumer protections for seniors and their families, and brings back risky practices that caused the 2008 financial crisis. It is the wrong direction, it is a wrong vote, and I caution my friends on the other side of the aisle the voters are going to remember this vote. Don't turn us back to the Stone Age of regulation.

I urge a very strong ''no'' vote on this wrongly directed ''Bad'' CHOICE Act.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the chair of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, the economic downturn in 2008 caused Michiganders and citizens around the country to lose their jobs, families to lose their savings, and way too many to lose their homes. Since that time, our friends on the other side of the aisle have attempted to convince the American people that Dodd-Frank was ''the answer'' to the financial crisis, despite the law failing to actually address the root cause of the downturn. In reality, Dodd-Frank has made it more difficult for hardworking taxpayers to secure a future for themselves and their children by denying them the economic recovery that they deserve.

Let's be honest: Dodd-Frank was an agenda waiting for a crisis. So many issues not related to economic stability were crammed into this flawed law that, now, big banks have gotten even bigger and small banks have disappeared at an alarming rate. Even worse, Dodd-Frank enshrined ''too big to fail'' and, frankly, put in place ''too small to save.''

Enough is enough. In order to increase economic opportunity, we must enact commonsense regulatory reform and restore accountability to Wall Street and to Washington. The House Financial Services Committee achieves this goal through a carefully crafted Financial CHOICE Act, which we are debating here today.

The Financial CHOICE Act eliminates Dodd-Frank's one-size-fits-all regulatory structure that has strangled community financial institutions with overly burdensome regulations that were meant for the largest banks in America. By enacting the CHOICE Act, community banks and credit unions can utilize their resources to help individual customers and small businesses achieve financial independence.

If we want small businesses to continue to be the engine of economic growth, we must remove the regulatory red tape that is preventing these community lenders from supporting small business job creators.

Additionally, the Financial CHOICE Act holds Wall Street accountable by imposing the toughest penalties in history. To protect consumers from financial fraud is a key goal for all of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, this important legislation also holds Washington bureaucrats accountable by creating constitutional checks and balances for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau so that it can more effectively do its job. No government agency should be unaccountable to the American people.

Lastly, this commonsense legislation protects taxpayers by eliminating too big to fail, something that my colleague had just talked about, and requires failing institutions to liquidate through a streamlined bankruptcy process, not taxpayer-funded bailouts. The process that she was talking about, this orderly liquidation authority, the government runs the bank for 5 years, and that is unacceptable.

So I hope you will join me in supporting this rule and supporting the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act. This bill will have a devastating impact on the ability of regulators to protect everyday Americans from future wrongdoing on Wall Street.

If you support consumers, you must oppose the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act. If you want to make sure that consumers have a fighting chance against those big banks and against illegal practices, then you must oppose the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act, because this act guts the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

In nearly 6 years, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has returned nearly $12 billion to 29 million Americans hurt by illegal financial practices, reduced $7.7 billion in consumer debts while winning $3.7 billion in compensation for consumers, and it has benefited nearly 50 million households in the form of new protections shielding consumers from surprise costs in terms on their mortgages and their credit cards.

Now, at a time when we have a student loan crisis in this country, $1.4 trillion in student debt, we have to make sure that we are protecting families, students, and young people around these predatory debt collection practices and all working families around predatory lending.

My home State of Washington was proud to work with the CFPB on those new regulations that would actually protect working people, make sure that they have off-ramps if they get into predatory loans and make sure that we regulate that industry.

The benefits of Dodd-Frank are not limited just to consumers, by the way. Big and small banks have benefited: lending is at record highs, and 2016 data from the FDIC shows that those banks are doing pretty well.

The financial crisis, which destroyed trillions of dollars in wealth and wreaked havoc on the financial lives of millions of families, was not a random event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JAYAPAL. The Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission itself said that widespread failures in financial regulation and rampant predatory lending practices were key drivers of the crisis. This bill ignores those lessons and takes us so far backwards, Mr. Speaker.

Real people are struggling to recover from that 2008 crisis, still, and instead of rolling back protections for consumers, we should be investing in jobs for everyday Americans. We should be making sure that the guy on Main Street or the woman on Main Street has a chance against those big banks and against all those predatory practices.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support consumers and working Americans and to oppose the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I note for the record that the best way for a student to repay student loans is to have a strong economy and not the anemic recovery that we had from the last recession.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before you today to speak on the rule and in support of H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act, which represents years of hard work by our chairman, JEB HENSARLING, and the entire Financial Services Committee.

For nearly 8 years, Dodd-Frank has targeted Main Street pocketbooks and stripped families of real opportunities for financial success and independence. For instance, the CFPB has spent years removing choices and making access to financial products more difficult to obtain. Under these regulations, it is now harder for families to qualify for a mortgage, to obtain an auto loan, and to access other forms of credit that they have depended on every day of their lives. Meanwhile, the CFPB fails to monitor and prevent actual and real instances of consumer fraud like we saw with the opening of millions of unauthorized customers' accounts at Wells Fargo.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of chairing the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee on Financial Services, and today—today—we released a report titled, ''Was the Cop on the Beat?'' This is regarding the CFPB's wholly inadequate role in investigating the Wells Fargo fraudulent account scandal.

We have received numerous records from both Wells Fargo and the OCC and others that indicate that the CFPB was asleep at the wheel when it came to investigating Wells Fargo. Unfortunately, the CFPB has produced no such documents, even under subpoena, that contradict this assertion and support the testimony of Director Cordray in front of this committee earlier in the year. This report highlights the need for reforms to the CFPB that are contained in the CHOICE Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, we need to bring accountability and transparency to a Bureau that has been thwarting congressional oversight and due process.

Additionally, the CHOICE Act will increase lending in our communities, open up our economy, end taxpayer-funded bailouts, and hold Wall Street and Washington accountable. Americans today deserve the ''Right'' CHOICE Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers?

Mr. BUCK. I do.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the chair of the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, when former President Obama signed the Dodd-Frank financial control law into law about 7 years ago, supporters promised that it would repair the economy; they promised that it would end too big to fail; they promised it would enhance financial stability and protect consumers. But none of those promises have been kept.

Nearly 9 years after the financial crisis, Americans are still stuck in the slowest, weakest economic recovery in 70 years. The percentage of Americans who are actually in the workforce is at its lowest level since the late 1970s, and we still have not fully reached the potential of our economic recovery. This is precisely because of the Dodd-Frank law. The Dodd-Frank law has clogged the plumbing of our economy with an avalanche of red tape.

Far from ending too big to fail, Dodd-Frank has guaranteed that too-big-to-fail banks will get a taxpayer bailout whenever they go into distress.

As big banks have gotten bigger as a result of Dodd-Frank, the small banks, the community banks, the credit unions—the credit providers for the entrepreneurs, the small businesses, the job creators in this country—are fewer. That is a huge problem for the dynamism of the economy, and that is one of the reasons why we haven't seen economic recovery the way that we should.

Dodd-Frank has made it more difficult for small businesses and startups to obtain capital to grow, invest, and hire. Before Dodd-Frank, small business lending was more than 150 percent of large bank lending. Today, due to Dodd-Frank, small bank lending is about 80 percent below that of large bank lending. This is why new business formation is at a generational low, because small businesses and startups and entrepreneurs have much more success obtaining capital from community banks than Wall Street banks.

Financial services and products have been impaired. Since Dodd-Frank, the number of banks offering free checking has shrunk from 75 percent to 37 percent, the ranks of the unbanked have gone up, and one in five community banks in my home State of Kentucky have disappeared as a result of Dodd-Frank.

Consumer protection? Hardly. Taking away financial services and products, eliminating competition and choice from the marketplace, eliminating free checking, taking away access to credit, that is not protecting consumers. That is hurting consumers. Dodd-Frank is the worst bill for consumers that we could possibly have.

We need the Financial CHOICE Act, which will preserve access to financial services and products and give consumers access to mortgages and access to financial products like credit cards and overdraft protection and home equity loans. All of these services and products are going away because of Dodd-Frank and the busybodies in Washington.

We need to protect consumers. There is nothing wrong with effective regulation, but this is regulation gone awry. It is unaccountable, it is not transparent, it is hurting the American consumers, and it is certainly not adding to financial stability when big banks and Wall Street are getting bigger and our community banks are going away.

□ 1345

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the chief deputy whip of the Republican Conference.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses and families are the backbone of small rural communities like the ones I represent in western North Carolina. The fact is that Dodd-Frank has had a crushing impact both on the ability of families and small businesses to access loans and the financial products that they need and deserve.

Half of what community banks did prior to Dodd-Frank was lending to small businesses. Now it is down to 20 percent of what they do. That is as a result of massive regulations that have come about as a result of Dodd-Frank.

For families, the availability of services that they used to commonly think is acceptable, like free checking and mortgage lending, are significantly diminished or altogether gone for them. Since Dodd-Frank became law, nearly three-quarters of community banks have either left or greatly reduced their mortgage businesses. This is problematic for families. The impact of these changes has hit rural communities like the ones I represent in western North Carolina the hardest.

But it doesn't end there. The law's mandates have driven up the cost of borrowing, making it harder and more expensive for families to access credit or save for important life events like saving for your child's college education.

Mr. Speaker, the Financial CHOICE Act changes much of this. It begins to undo the damage caused by Dodd-Frank by removing onerous Washington mandates, very expensive regulations, by cutting off access to financial products that the American people need and desire.

Additionally, the Financial CHOICE Act actually addresses the plight of small businesses by cleaning up these messy regulations that are unclear, that have made the marketplace less safe and secure for lending and small businesses, and encouraging the use of innovative new forms of capital formation that help businesses grow and prosper.

That means jobs. This bill is directed at growing the American economy, getting us back on our feet, and helping expand prosperity not just to urban or rural areas, but to both, to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill and get on with the business of legislating.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, the Financial CHOICE Act. The acronym CHOICE stands for Creating Hope and Opportunity for Investors, Consumers, and Entrepreneurs. This legislation could be very well entitled the ''Make America Grow Again Act.''

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, understate the importance of economic growth and what that means to this country: jobs, better jobs; wages, higher wages; and revenues, more revenues coming into the Federal Treasury as a result of healthy economic growth that will allow us to pay for the critical programs that people in this country depend on, whether seniors, veterans, infrastructure.

You pay for your government with a healthy growing economy. That is not what we have today. We must grow again, especially as we think of these individuals.

Opponents of this legislation are defending a stagnant status quo. They are defending a status quo that has given us the slowest economy since the Great Depression, a status quo responsible for the loss of 1,400 community banks, a status quo that has a community bank or credit union closing every single day, a status quo that has resulted in the noncreation of 650,000 small businesses—that would mean 6.5 million jobs. Six and a half million people who would be paying taxes, paying Social Security taxes, paying Medicare taxes, allowing us to meet the commitments that we have—a status quo that has eliminated free checking, a status quo that is closing branch office banks in small towns in my district, a status quo that allows unaccountable agencies in this town to continue to have too much power and taking away choices from individuals.

This legislation will end too big to fail and will end too small to succeed. Regardless of who you are or where you come from, you should have access to affordable reliable financial services.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time. The points have been made. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

With each passing day, we learn more about the tangled web of conflicts of interest and links to Russia and the Trump administration. Just last week we learned that President Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner, attempted to establish a back channel of communications with Russia and the Trump transition team before they were even inaugurated.

Tomorrow, former FBI Director James Comey will likely testify that President Trump attempted to influence the FBI's investigation into possible collusion between his campaign and the Russian Government.

Who knows what further ties to Russia we will uncover from his testimony.

Without President Trump's tax returns, we simply have no way of knowing if he himself has financial ties to Russia, as news reports have suggested. The American people deserve to know whether or not our President has any business dealings with Russia or other foreign governments. It is imperative that we prevent the White House from becoming another arm of the Trump organization.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative ESHOO's bill, H.R. 305, which would require Presidents and major party nominees for the Presidency to release their tax returns.

If the President has nothing to hide, including financial interests or business dealings with Russia, then he should freely release his tax returns to reassure the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of my amendment, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the majority why we enacted the Wall Street reform in the first place.

Our country was plunged into the worst recession since the Great Depression after big Wall Street firms played Russian roulette with our future for years. During the 2008 financial crash, more than 8 million Americans lost their jobs, $13 trillion in wealth vanished overnight, and 11 million homes were lost.

After years of excesses and dodging regulation, the financial firms were finally brought under control by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The perverse notion of too big to fail was finally ended, and the financial playing field was tilted back toward consumers.

We have all seen the results of the law in the form of record-setting private sector job growth, millions of new jobs, and historic rates of business lending. It is beyond me why anyone in the world would want to repeal this law and threaten this progress. Instead of doing the bidding of the financial lobbyists who don't really care for the law, we should be acting to uphold the trust of the people who sent us here.

This begins with passing the End Congressional Stock Market Abuse Act to bring an end to the egregious use of exclusive stock deals and foreign initial public offerings by Members of Congress.

The American people must be able to trust what we are doing here and trust that it is right for them without concern that we are using our position to enrich ourselves.

My bill would enhance the STOCK Act, which passed the Chamber virtually unanimously—two ''no'' votes—in 2012, with provisions that I think we could all agree on: no exclusive stock deals for Members of Congress, no initial public offerings, regardless of where they are offered.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we should be focusing on today, not dismantling a law that has brought financial security to millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, to oppose the underlying legislation, the ''Wrong'' CHOICE Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is not for the big banks. It is not for the bureaucrats and their swanky downtown office at CFPB. This legislation was crafted for the American people, the men and women who work hard every day to earn a living. These individuals want choice in the financial products they can buy. They want healthy community banks. They want lower taxes instead of Wall Street bailouts.

The Financial CHOICE Act was written over the past several years with these people in mind. We will restore hope and opportunity for them.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING and the Financial Services Committee for their hard work on this bill. I thank Chairman SESSIONS for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the resolution, and then to vote ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the Previous Question so that the House can vote on my bipartisan legislation, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act.

I first introduced the Presidential Tax Transparency Act exactly one year ago today, along with my Senate counterpart RON WYDEN. This bill would codify the longstanding tradition of presidents disclosing their tax returns. The bill is simple, it is bipartisan, and it has the support of the American people. A recent poll found that 80 percent of Americans believe the President should disclose his tax returns. Earlier today, a petition was delivered to Congress with over 4 million signatures calling on the House to take up this bill.

Since I introduced the Presidential Tax Transparency Act a year ago, candidate Trump and now President Trump has amassed serious ethical lapses, troubling connections to Russian officials, and countless potential conflicts of interest, all while hiding his full financial information from the public.

Mr. Trump is the first president in decades to refuse to disclose his tax returns as a candidate and as President. We know from his candidate financial disclosure filed last year that the President has 564 financial positions in companies around the world, and owes at least $300 million in debts to various banks. But there's no way for us to verify these claims without his tax return information.

Disclosure of the President's tax returns would provide answers to many of the troubling questions surrounding this Administration's connections to Russia. In recent weeks, the President pressured the FBI Director to stop investigating Michael Flynn's Russia connections and then fired him. There are near-daily revelations of undisclosed meetings with Russian officials, disclosures of classified information, and more evidence that the Russians sought to directly interfere in our election.

Only with full disclosure of his tax returns will we know the true sources of the President's income, the holders of his debt, and the extent of any business ties to Russia and other foreign countries.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the will of the American people and join our bipartisan effort to exercise Congress's constitutional duty to serve as a check on the Executive Branch. By defeating the Previous Question and voting to approve the Presidential Tax Transparency Act today, this body can start the process of obtaining the truth that the American people want and are entitled to.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 375 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 305) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 305.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous

question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 374;

Adopting House Resolution 374, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 375; and

Adopting House Resolution 375, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 374) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—228

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—189

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Babin
Clyburn
Cummings
Delaney
Engel
Gohmert
Johnson, Sam
Marino
Napolitano
Reichert
Rokita
Smith (TX)

□ 1419

Messrs. KILDEE, PANETTA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 185, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—231

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt
Babin
Clyburn
Cummings
Delaney
Engel
Green, Al
Johnson, Sam
Larson (CT)
Marino
Napolitano
Reichert
Sherman
Smith (TX)

□ 1427

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately release his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has responsibility to hold the executive branch of government to a fair and equal standard of transparency ensuring the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline of reasonable information including whether the President paid taxes, ownership interests, charitable donations made, and whether tax deductions have been exploited;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President recently fired Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, under whose leadership the FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, President Trump reportedly stated to Russian officials during a White House meeting that he fired Director Comey to ease pressure on the ongoing investigation of Russia's influence in the 2016 election;

Whereas, Senate Russia investigators have requested information from the Treasury Department's criminal investigation division, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, which handles cases of money laundering, for information related to President Trump, his top officials and campaign aides. FinCEN has been investigating allegations of foreign money-laundering through purchases of U.S. real estate;

Whereas, the President's tax returns would show us whether he has foreign bank accounts and how much profit he receives from his ownership in myriad partnerships;

Whereas, Donald Trump Jr. said The Trump Organization saw money ''pouring in from Russia'' and that ''Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets'';

Whereas, Congress gave itself the authority to review an individual's tax returns to investigate and reveal possible conflicts of interest of executive branch officials involved dating back to the Teapot Dome scandal;

Whereas, it has been reported that federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian involvement in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his

businesses, and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution for the express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any ''present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state'';

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President's tax returns under section 6103 of the Tax Code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, Director Comey has testified that tax returns are a common tool in investigations because they can show income and motives;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives shall:

One, immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives;

Two, support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Massachusetts will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 375) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 185, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—228

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—185

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Aderholt
Babin
Brady (TX)
Clyburn
Cummings
Ellison
Engel
Green, Al
Johnson, Sam
Marino
Napolitano
Pelosi
Reichert
Rooney, Thomas J.
Sherman
Smith (TX)
Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1443

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 290.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 289 and "nay" on rollcall No. 290.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes:

1. H. Res. 374, Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2213. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion.

2. Motion on ordering the Previous Question on the Rule. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—231

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—188

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Babin
Clyburn
Cummings
Engel
Johnson, Sam
Marino
McEachin
Napolitano
Reichert
Smith (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1449

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 291 on H.R. 10, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yea" when I should have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 288, No. 289, No. 290, and No. 291 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule—Providing for consideration of H.R. 2213. I would have voted "no" on H. Res. 374—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2213—Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017. I would have voted "nay" on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 10. I would have voted "nay" on H. Res. 375—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 10—Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

NATIONAL GEORGE C. MARSHALL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 33) designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 33

Whereas General George C. Marshall served as Army Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense;

Whereas General George C. Marshall was promoted to General of the Army in 1944, one of only five Army five-star generals in the history of the United States;

Whereas General George C. Marshall was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 1946 for his military strategy and vital role during World War II;

Whereas General George C. Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953 for developing the European economic recovery strategy known as the Marshall Plan;

Whereas the George C. Marshall Foundation was established in 1953 and is devoted to preserving the legacy of General George C. Marshall through educational scholarship programs and facilities;

Whereas the George C. Marshall Foundation opened the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in 1964 in Lexington, Virginia, on the post of the Virginia Military Institute, which is the alma mater of General George C. Marshall;

Whereas the George C. Marshall Museum educates the public about the military and diplomatic contributions of General George C. Marshall through extensive exhibits; and

Whereas the George C. Marshall Research Library maintains the most comprehensive collection of records documenting the life and leadership of General George C. Marshall: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress designates the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 33.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 33, a resolution that designates the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

George C. Marshall was one of America's most distinguished soldiers, a dedicated statesman, and a genuine peacemaker. General Marshall served as Army Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, and Secretaries of both the Departments of State and Defense. He was promoted to General of the Army in 1944—one of only nine individuals in our Nation's history to rise to the rank of a five-star officer—and was also awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 1946.

In addition, General Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953 for developing the European economic recovery strategy known as the Marshall Plan, which was essential to bringing peace to the postwar European continent.

To honor the legacy of such an accomplished man, the George C. Marshall Foundation was created in 1953, to pay tribute to General Marshall's contributions to our Nation and the world during some of the most perilous and tumultuous times of the 20th century. The Marshall Foundation preserves this legacy through educational facilities and scholarship programs.

The George C. Marshall Foundation opened the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in 1964, in Lexington, Virginia, on the post of the Virginia Military Institute, the alma mater of General Marshall. The library provides scholars with a documented record of the life of General Marshall and his public service, and the museum shares his inspiring story with visitors through exhibitions, artifacts, and educational programs.

General Marshall's contributions to our Nation and our world cannot be overstated, and I hope to see this resolution adopted to designate the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

Both institutions work tirelessly to highlight and share General Marshall's work and service, and this is a fitting tribute to a man who spent a lifetime faithfully and courageously serving his country at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 33, designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library. I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), for sponsoring the resolution and note that the entire Virginia delegation has signed on as original cosponsors.

General George C. Marshall is a national hero, a distinguished public servant, and treasured piece of Virginia's history. Located in Lexington, Virginia, the George C. Marshall Museum and Library are located on the campus of the Virginia Military Institute, his alma mater.

General Marshall served our country as the Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, Secretary of State, president of the Red Cross, Secretary of Defense, and is one of only five Army five-star generals in the United States.

After World War II, General Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953, for his role in developing the European Recovery Program better known as the Marshall Plan. This week we are commemorating the 70th anniversary of the Marshall Plan speech given on June 5, 1947, at Harvard University. The Marshall Plan contributed to European integration and growth in the aftermath of World War II.

As the holder of the George C. Marshall papers and with a mission to collect, preserve, and share information regarding the life and career of General Marshall, it is apt to make this institution the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

Mr. Speaker, considering the important place in our Nation's history that General Marshall holds, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of H. Con. Res. 33. This resolution would designate the George C. Marshall Museum and the George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

I would like to thank Chairwoman FOXX, Ranking Member SCOTT, and Mr. BRAT for their work in bringing this legislation to the floor today.

It is only fitting that we consider this resolution on the week of the 70th anniversary of George C. Marshall's speech at Harvard University where he proposed a comprehensive foreign assistance program—later coined as the Marshall Plan—to help rebuild the war-torn and devastated economies in Western Europe after World War II.

General George Catlett Marshall dedicated his life to public service—serving honorably in the United States Army, as Army Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense. He was one of only five five-star generals ever to serve in our military.

From his allied plan to storm the beaches of Normandy to the Marshall Plan, his leadership changed the world. The history of the United States and the global community would be a different place if not for the contributions of General Marshall.

At the recommendation of former President Harry Truman, the Marshall Foundation was established in 1953. On May 23, 1964, the Marshall Museum and Library was dedicated on the post of the Virginia Military Institute—General Marshall's alma mater.

□ 1500

For over 50 years, the Marshall Foundation has devoted its mission to educating the public about the important contributions of General Marshall.

The museum has five extensive exhibits and houses General Marshall's 1953 Nobel Peace Prize. The research library collects, preserves, and shares the largest collection of documents pertaining to General Marshall's life.

Just last year, the Marshall Foundation reached a huge milestone with the completion of the Papers of George Catlett Marshall. This project began in 1977 with a goal to create a published record of every document that General Marshall produced. The final project consists of 7 volumes and includes 4,260 documents spanning over 5,666 pages.

In addition to its extensive research work, the Marshall Foundation provides educational opportunities for college students and future military leaders.

The Marshall Undergraduate Scholars program sends college history students to the Marshall Foundation to conduct primary research in the library's archives. The Marshall Army ROTC Award Seminar also provides the top ROTC cadet at each college in the United States the opportunity to participate in a national security conference with fellow award recipients and current Army leaders. The Marshall-Arnold Air Force ROTC Award Seminar provides a similar opportunity to top senior cadets at each college with an Air Force ROTC program.

Two years ago, the Marshall Foundation began the Marshall Legacy Series—this multiyear series of exhibits, lectures, and events to showcase General Marshall's contributions during the 20th century, and connects those contributions to today's world.

This is just a snapshot of the important work the Marshall Foundation conducts to honor and preserve the legacy of General Marshall. I am honored to have such a distinguished institution in my district, the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia.

General Marshall once said: ''Sincerity, integrity, and tolerance are, to my mind, the first requirements of many to a fine, strong character.''

I applaud the Marshall Foundation's work in sharing Marshall's vision and character with a new generation of Americans. I urge passage of this resolution to honor one of America's most sincere and distinguished public servants by congressionally designating the museum and library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my Virginia colleagues for their leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are advancing a bipartisan proposal today, one that means a great deal to the people in my home State of Virginia, to designate the George C. Marshall Museum and Library as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library. We do this to honor a great American hero and his enduring legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 33.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 374, I call up the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 374, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2213

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. HIRING FLEXIBILITY.

Section 3 of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–376; 6 U.S.C. 221) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsections:

''(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may waive the application of subsection (a)(1) in the following circumstances:

''(1) In the case of a current, full-time law enforcement officer employed by a State or local law enforcement agency, if such officer—

''(A) has served as a law enforcement officer for not fewer than three years with no break in service;

''(B) is authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of, or the incarceration of any person for, any violation of law, and has statutory powers for arrest or apprehension;

''(C) is not currently under investigation, has not been found to have engaged in criminal activity or serious misconduct, has not resigned from a law enforcement officer position under investigation or in lieu of termination, and has not been dismissed from a law enforcement officer position; and

''(D) has, within the past ten years, successfully completed a polygraph examination as a condition of employment with such officer's current law enforcement agency.

''(2) In the case of a current, full-time law enforcement officer employed by a Federal law enforcement agency, if such officer—

''(A) has served as a law enforcement officer for not fewer than three years with no break in service;

''(B) has authority to make arrests, conduct investigations, conduct searches, make seizures, carry firearms, and serve orders, warrants, and other processes;

''(C) is not currently under investigation, has not been found to have engaged in criminal activity or serious misconduct, has not resigned from a law enforcement officer position under investigation or in lieu of termination, and has not been dismissed from a law enforcement officer position; and

''(D) holds a current Tier 4 background investigation or current Tier 5 background investigation.

''(3) In the case of an individual who is a member of the Armed Forces (or a reserve component thereof) or a veteran, if such individual—

''(A) has served in the Armed Forces for not fewer than three years;

''(B) holds, or has held within the past five years, a Secret, Top Secret, or Top Secret / Sensitive Compartmented Information clearance;

''(C) holds, or has undergone within the past five years, a current Tier 4 background investigation or current Tier 5 background investigation;

''(D) received, or is eligible to receive, an honorable discharge from service in the Armed Forces and has not engaged in criminal activity or committed a serious military or civil offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice; and

''(E) was not granted any waivers to obtain the clearance referred to subparagraph (B).

''(c) TERMINATION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The authority to issue a waiver under subsection (b) shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.''.

SEC. 3. SUPPLEMENTAL COMMISSIONER AUTHORITY AND DEFINITIONS.

(a) SUPPLEMENTAL COMMISSIONER AUTHORITY.—Section 4 of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–376) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 4. SUPPLEMENTAL COMMISSIONER AUTHORITY.

''(a) NON-EXEMPTION.—An individual who receives a waiver under subsection (b) of section 3 is not exempt from other hiring requirements relating to suitability for employment and eligibility to hold a national security designated position, as determined by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

''(b) BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS.—Any individual who receives a waiver under subsection (b) of section 3 who holds a current Tier 4 background investigation shall be subject to a Tier 5 background investigation.

''(c) ADMINISTRATION OF POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection is authorized to administer a polygraph examination to an applicant or employee who is eligible for or receives a waiver under subsection (b) of section 3 if information is discovered prior to the completion of a background investigation that results in a determination that a polygraph examination is necessary to make a final determination regarding suitability for employment or continued employment, as the case may be.''.

(b) REPORT.—The Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 5. REPORTING.

''Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section and every year for the next four years thereafter, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall provide the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate information on the number, disaggregated with respect to each of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b) of section 3, of waivers requested, granted, and denied, and the reasons for any such denial, and the final outcome of the application for employment at issue. Such information shall also include the number of instances a polygraph examination was administered under the conditions described in subsection (c) of section 4, the result of such examination, and the final outcome of the application for employment at issue.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—The Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010, as amended by subsection (b) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

''In this Act:

''(1) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term 'law enforcement officer' has the meaning given

such term in sections 8331(20) and 8401(17) of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) VETERAN.—The term 'veteran' has the meaning given such term in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code.

''(3) SERIOUS MILITARY OR CIVIL OFFENSE.—The term 'serious military or civil offense' means an offense for which—

''(A) a member of the Armed Forces may be discharged or separated from service in the Armed Forces; and

''(B) a punitive discharge is, or would be, authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the Manual for Court-Martial, as pursuant to Army Regulation 635-200 chapter 14-12.

''(4) TIER 4; TIER 5.—The terms 'Tier 4' and 'Tier 5' with respect to background investigations have the meaning given such terms under the 2012 Federal Investigative Standards.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 2213.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDING ON AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2213 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and in support of the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, the failed immigration policies of the previous administration have kept our borders open, weakened our national security, and put millions of American lives at risk from an increasing number of grave and growing threats. These threats come from drug cartels, gang members, human traffickers, and international terrorists who seek to do our country harm.

Fortunately, we now have a partner in the White House who understands that we cannot rely on the oceans or other natural boundaries alone to separate us from those looking to infiltrate our homeland.

This morning, I was once again pleased to welcome Secretary Kelly before the Committee on Homeland Security and listen to him articulate the importance of border security to the Trump administration.

We know we need a 21st century border to meet 21st century threats. Sadly, every few days, we hear a story on the news that reminds us of the dangerous consequences of Washington's inability to achieve that goal.

As a former Federal prosecutor and the chief of counterterrorism and national security in the U.S. Attorney's Office in Texas, I have seen how people take advantage of our Nation's open borders. Over time, those who are determined to come here illegally become agile. They adapt to the measures that we take to stop them. It is obvious that we need a new approach.

When it comes to strengthening our borders, additional funds and new technology will be necessary. However, our strongest assets are the courageous men and women who serve as Border Patrol agents and Customs and Border Protection officers. These patriots put their lives on the line every single day to protect us while also safeguarding our economic relationships that boost American jobs and grow American businesses.

However, we are almost 1,800 Border Patrol agents and 1,000 CBP officers short of having the force that we need to keep our borders secure. Our forces are stretched thin and our efforts to recruit additional officers and agents have slowed due to strict requirements for new applicants. Currently, it takes an average of 113 applicants to hire just one new officer or agent. This is a major problem that must be addressed.

This legislation offers a solution by providing the CBP Commissioner with the flexibility to hire State and local law enforcement officers who have already served for 3 years without a break in service, are not under investigation or have been found guilty of misconduct, and have previously passed a law enforcement polygraph exam.

It also provides the CBP Commissioner with the authority to hire members and veterans of the armed services who have held security clearances and who have already completed a robust background check.

To put it simply, this bill will make it easier for some of America's finest law enforcement officers and soldiers to help protect our borders.

As drugs continue to creep into our neighborhoods and wreak havoc on our communities and terrorists advance their plans to attack our country and disrupt our way of life, we must make sure we have an adequate force to protect our borders.

This needs to be a priority. This should not be a partisan issue. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this bill passed unanimously out of my committee. Members from both parties should come together, as they did at the committee level, as Mr. VELA did, and support this effort.

American families deserve to know that we are doing everything we can to keep our homeland safe. This legislation gives us a chance to do just that.

I would like to thank my colleague and chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, Congresswoman MCSALLY from Arizona, for all of her hard work on this bill. As a Representative from a district along our Southern border, she fully understands more than any Member the seriousness of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

I have forcefully rejected the President's mass deportation efforts from the beginning, and I will continue to do so.

Many of us have appropriately criticized our President for wrongfully attributing the criminal actions of a few undocumented individuals to the entire undocumented population. Equally here, it would be hypocritical to attribute the criminal actions of a few rogue agents to the hardworking men and women that protect our Nation every day and who uphold the ethical standards that we should expect.

The Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017 will assist CBP in fulfilling its mission to facilitate legitimate trade and travel at our ports of entry.

According to the Joint Economic Committee, the volume of commerce crossing our borders has more than tripled in the last 25 years. Currently, 1.1 million people and $5.9 billion in goods enter and exit the U.S. at 328 U.S. ports of entry every day.

In fiscal year 2016, CBP officers and agents seized and/or disrupted more than 3.3 million pounds of narcotics across the country, including approximately 46,000 pounds of methamphetamine, 48,000 pounds of heroin, and 440 pounds of fentanyl, keeping these harmful drugs off of our streets.

CBP has struggled with recruiting the officers and agents to fill its frontline ranks at our Nation's air, land, and seaports. Currently, there are 1,400 unfilled positions within the CBP workforce at our Nation's ports of entry. Delays and short staffing at our ports of entry costs the United States economy up to $5.8 billion each year.

Under this bill, the CBP Commissioner may, on a case-by-case basis, exempt certain veterans and State and local law enforcement officers who meet specific standards, such as holding a security clearance and previously passing a polygraph, from having to take the CBP polygraph as a part of the hiring process. All other vetting requirements in the 12-step hiring process for these applicants will still apply.

This bill simply grants CBP limited authority to waive a single step in its robust vetting process for qualifying applicants who hold security clearances or who have successfully completed polygraphs.

I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, and Chairwoman MCSALLY for their work on this bill. I also thank Chairman MCCAUL and Chairwoman MCSALLY by accepting changes offered by the minority to improve this bill.

Ranking Member THOMPSON offered an amendment in committee to require CBP to report to Congress how many of these waivers are requested, granted, and denied; the reasons for these denials; as well as whether these applicants are ultimately hired or not.

□ 1515

Additionally, it requires CBP to inform Congress on the number of applicants who are granted a waiver but undergo a polygraph examination anyway based on information discovered during their background investigation. Congress must remain vigilant about how the waiver authority is used, and this amendment will ensure we have the information to do so.

Mr. Speaker, in short, the men and women on the front lines of CBP need our help. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the sponsor of the bill and the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection has two key missions: securing the border and facilitating cross-border commerce that powers the Nation's economic growth. In order to accomplish those missions, they need enough agents and officers to be able to make arrests, interdict drug loads, screen cargo from countries of concern, or move legitimate commerce and passengers through an air, land, and sea port of entry.

U.S. Border Patrol agents and CBP officers are, at the end of the day, the most important border security and trade resource we have. Unfortunately, they are in short supply these days, which has created a national security and economic vulnerability that this Congress must address.

CBP is critically understaffed and remains well below its congressionally mandated staffing levels by more than 1,000 CBP officers and 1,800 border patrol agents. The manpower shortage is getting worse. We are losing ground every single month, and there is no end in sight as we continue to lose experienced agents and officers through attrition without the ability to efficiently hire new ones. For example, CBP has invested $200 million in a port of entry infrastructure in Arizona, alone, over the last 8 years, but there is simply not enough staff to open up every lane that is available.

I want to emphasize this point: officer and agent shortages did not happen overnight. The U.S. Border Patrol has not met its congressionally mandated hiring numbers since fiscal year 2014, and CBP has been losing officers to man our ports since early in fiscal year 2016.

At the current hiring rate, approximately 113 applicants go through the process in order to hire a single officer or agent. That means CBP needs to have hundreds of thousands of people apply just to meet their current needs. We need more manpower to properly secure our border, screen passengers at our Nation's airports who arrive from overseas, and facilitate cross-border commerce that powers our economy.

There are several underlying issues that are responsible for these current staffing woes. For starters, it takes more than 292 days for these 12 distinct steps, on average, to hire a new officer or agent. And even with the newer expedited system that is supposed to condense these steps into just several days, it still takes an average of 160 days to complete the process. Very few people can wait somewhere between 6 months to a year for a job. We are losing very experienced and already vetted applicants.

Several years ago, the committee began working directly with the previous administration to find solutions to these staffing problems and the hiring process. The bill under consideration today represents the fruits of that bipartisan work and, as a result, was passed out of the Homeland Security Committee unanimously last month.

My bill allows the Commissioner of CBP to waive the polygraph requirement for current State and local law enforcement officers who have already passed a polygraph examination, Federal law enforcement officers who have already passed a stringent background investigation, and veterans with at least 3 consecutive years in the military who have held a security clearance and passed a background check.

These exemptions are purely discretionary, not mandatory. If there is something in an applicant's history or background that causes CBP concern, they can still use the polygraph exam to resolve those questions.

These small changes will provide CBP with immediate relief so they are able to quickly, yet judiciously, hire officers and agents from a pool of qualified applicants who already maintain the public's trust and put their lives on the line for our security and our safety on a daily basis.

I want to make my position very clear. Everyone who applies to be a CBP officer or Border Patrol agent should be thoroughly vetted to ensure there are no integrity issues in their background and they are not at risk for corruption. That is how the current system operates, and nothing in this bill would change that. That is why Congress required polygraph examinations and stringent background checks for agents in the first place.

I fully support the use of polygraph examinations to weed out people who are unfit to wear the badge or carry a gun, but we can and should make these very narrow, sensible, and straightforward allowances to permit CBP to hire those who have already been vetted and proven by their service in uniform that they are suitable to become agents and officers.

The National Treasury Employees Union, who represent the officers who are stationed at the ports of entry; the Non Commissioned Officers Association, who represent many of our veterans; the Fraternal Order of Police; the Border Trade Alliance; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and the Department of Homeland Security all support this bill. Indeed, this is a rare bill that has united both management and labor.

I include these letters of support in the RECORD.

THE NATIONAL TREASURY EMPLOYEES UNION,
June 5, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Officers at the Department of Homeland Security who are stationed at 328 land, sea and air ports of entry represented by the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), I ask you to vote YES on H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017. This legislation would expand the applicant pool for vacant CBP Officer positions by allowing the CBP Commissioner to waive polygraph requirements for certain categories of job applicants.

NTEU continues to have significant concerns about the slow pace of hiring at CBP. CBP has struggled to fill 2,000 Officer positions that Congress authorized in 2014. A major impediment to fulfilling CBP's hiring goal is that CBP is the only federal agency with a congressional mandate that all frontline officer applicants receive a polygraph test. Two out of three applicants fail its polygraph—about 65 percent—more than double the average rate of eight law enforcement agencies according to data provided to the Associated Press. The eight law enforcement agencies that supplied this information showed an average failure rate of 28 percent. As an example, the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration failed 36 percent of applicants in the past two years.

NTEU does not seek to reduce the standards used by CBP in their hiring process, but believes that there is a problem with how the polygraph is currently administered. We have asked CBP to review its current polygraph policy to understand why CBP is failing applicants at a much higher rate than individuals applying to work at other federal law enforcement agencies. H.R. 2213 expands the authority to waive polygraph examinations for certain veterans and law enforcement officers, while also safeguarding CBP's right to administer the polygraph for these exempted applicants if a need arises.

Improving the current polygraph program should help in expediting the CBP Officer hiring process so that the existing 1,400 vacancies can be filled allowing CBP to move forward with funding and hiring the 2,107 additional Officers required by CBP's Workforce Staffing Model. NTEU also recommends that CBP allow immediate polygraph re-testing opportunities to those with a No Opinion or Inconclusive result, including those with a No Opinion Counter Measures finding.

NTEU asks you to vote YES on H.R. 2213.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON,
National President.

NON COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
June 6, 2017.

Hon. RON JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: On behalf of the Non-Commissioned Officers Association (NCOA), a Veteran Service Organization of over 55,000 members, I am writing to offer support for the ''Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017,'' which was ordered reported as S. 595 by the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on May 17, 2017, and reported as H.R. 2213 by the House Homeland Security Committee on May 16, 2017. NCOA supports the goal of increasing border security through easing polygraph requirements for Veterans who have already taken a polygraph and are interested in serving the border security mission.

NCOA has been working with CBP to help fulfill its hiring and recruiting mission. CBP is faced with numerous challenges—many of which can be assisted by looking to our nation's transitioning Veterans. NCOA has had an extensive and national transition program for our NCOs for decades and believe that our Veterans are qualified, trained, and committed to the mission of protecting our nation.

NCOA supports amendments to the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Pub. L. No. 111–376), which fosters integrity in the workplace by requiring that all CBP applicants for law enforcement positions receive a polygraph examination before being offered employment. The amendments proposed by S. 595 and H.R. 2213 would enable CBP to develop a risk-based approach to extend polygraph waiver eligibility to an applicant who falls under one of three categories and satisfies specific criteria including but not limited to:

1. A Current State or Local Law Enforcement Officer with a successfully completed polygraph examination with the applicant's law enforcement agency, at least three consecutive years employed as a fully authorized law enforcement officer, and no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct;

2. A Current Federal Law Enforcement Officer with at least three consecutive years employed as a fully authorized federal law enforcement officer, a current/in-scope Tier 4 Background Investigation or a Tier 5 Single Scope Background Investigation, and no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct; or

3. A Transitioning Military Service Member, Veteran, or Member of the Reserves or National Guard who has at least four years of service in the military, no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct, and who holds or has held (within the past five years) a Secret, Top Secret, or Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information clearance and was not granted any waivers to obtain that clearance.

NCOA believes the flexibility to waive the polygraph for the Veteran categories outlined in the amendment makes sense and would potentially expedite their onboarding to a position in border patrol. Currently, the onboarding process simply takes too long and CBP loses great candidates, and Veterans go elsewhere.

We also strongly disagree with objections to this small alteration to the polygraph policies—we are talking about Veterans and others who have already committed their lives to protecting the nation and its citizens and to say otherwise is pure fallacy and dirty politics.

Thank you for your attention and for your efforts to help secure our borders and enable transitioning Veterans to find meaningful employment.

Respectfully,

JON OSTROWSKI,
BMCS (ret.) U.S. Coast Guard, Executive Director, NCOA.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, PELOSI AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 2213, the ''Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act,'' and to urge the House to pass it.

The pace of hiring at the Customs and Border Protection in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security has been problematic for several years. This legislation would expand the applicant front line officers pool to fill vacant officer positions at CBP by allowing the Commissioner to waive the polygraph requirements in certain cases. The CBP is one of the few Federal agencies that requires all its front-line officers to pass a polygraph—a test that two of three applicants will fail. This rate of failure is considerably higher than other Federal law enforcement agencies and the FOP strongly recommends that how these tests are administered be reviewed to determine why this is the case.

The bill will give the CBP greater flexibility by allowing the polygraph test to be waived for certain veterans and law enforcement officers. This will enable the CBP to fill its positions without compromising the integrity of their hiring process.

On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we are pleased to support this legislation and look forward to its passage in the House. If I can be of any further assistance on this or any other issue, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Senior Advisor Jim Pasco in my Washington, D.C. office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

BORDER TRADE ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

Hon. MARTHA MCSALLY,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCSALLY: The Border Trade Alliance (BTA) supports your legislation, H.R. 2213, The Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017, which contains important reforms to the polygraph examination process employed in the recruitment of Customs and Border Protection officers.

For over 30 years, the BTA has sought to support public policies that encourage robust cross-border trade while ensuring our ports of entry have the resources necessary to process that trade securely and efficiently. Adequate port staffing is critical to realizing those goals.

We share your belief that CBP's ability to recruit new officers into its ranks is hamstrung by a polygraph screening that is overly burdensome and not properly aligned with the needs of today's CBP.

CBP's failure to meet Congress' calls for hiring 2,000 new officers must be addressed swiftly, or our borders will continue to be characterized by long delays and congestion.

Your bill wisely seeks to streamline the recruitment process by waving the existing polygraph exam process for current state or local law enforcement officers in good standing if they have already completed a polygraph examination as a condition of their employment or, in the case of federal law enforcement officials, have already completed a Tier 4 or 5 background investigation. In the case of members of the military or veterans, your bill allows the polygraph exam to be waived for individuals who have received high level security clearances. Finally, your legislation contains an added level of security by permitting CBP to administer a polygraph exam in those cases where a background investigation indicates a polygraph examination is necessary to make a final determination regarding an applicant's suitability for employment or an employee's continued employment.

The reforms contained in your legislation are important as we seek new ways to attract talented, qualified individuals into CBP careers with as few redundant, bureaucratic hurdles as possible, while still strengthening border security and ensuring the highest degree of confidence in new recruits.

The Border Trade Alliance is proud to support your legislation and we commend you for working in a bipartisan fashion. Our organization stands ready to assist you in your efforts to advance this bill through to passage.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL L. JONES,
Chairman.

BRITTON CLARKE,
President.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL AND RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports H.R. 2213, the ''Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.'' This legislation is a positive development for national security, veterans' employment, and facilitating trade and travel as it addresses the shortage of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officers at our borders.

Over the past several years, attempts have been made to increase the ranks of CBP officers. It is clear from CBP's own staffing model that additional resources are needed to adequately secure the homeland and facilitate legitimate trade and travel. This legislation would provide the flexibility to expedite the hiring process for qualified individuals who have already proven themselves through service in local law enforcement or the military.

To meet the staffing levels set by Congress, this legislation is critical and would help on both the national security and economic fronts. A recent study found that every batch of 33 CBP officers hired could lead to an increase in GDP of $61.8 million and employment gains of 1,053 jobs in the U.S.

The Chamber appreciates the Committee's continued engagement to ensure that our borders have the appropriate resources and looks forward to advancing this bipartisan legislation.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 2, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: On behalf of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), I am writing to offer support for the ''Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017,'' which was ordered reported as S. 595 by the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on May 17, 2017, and reported as H.R. 2213 by the House Homeland Security Committee on May 16, 2017. DHS supports the goal of increasing border security through balanced investments in infrastructure, technology, and personnel.

CBP has worked aggressively during the past two years to implement its multifaceted recruitment strategy and execute large-scale improvements to its frontline hiring process. While these efforts have led to considerable progress in many areas, CBP is examining every aspect of its pre-employment hiring process to identify areas in which additional improvements can be made. CBP's challenges in recruitment are, to a great extent, contingent on our rigorous hiring process, which is designed to ensure only those individuals who meet the qualifications of CBP's frontline positions and have the highest degree of integrity are recruited to serve as agents and officers safeguarding our borders and ports of entry. While many modifications to streamline the pre-employment hiring process are being considered, CBP will not lower its high standards for any of its frontline personnel.

DHS supports amendments to the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Pub. L. No. 111–376), which fosters integrity in the workplace by requiring that all CBP applicants for law enforcement positions receive a polygraph examination before being offered employment. The amendments proposed by S. 595 and H.R. 2213 would enable CBP to develop a risk-based approach to extend polygraph waiver eligibility to an applicant who falls under one of three categories and satisfies specific criteria including but not limited to:

1. A Current State or Local Law Enforcement Officer with a successfully completed polygraph examination with the applicant's law enforcement agency, at least three consecutive years employed as a fully authorized law enforcement officer, and no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct;

2. A Current Federal Law Enforcement Officer with at least three consecutive years employed as a fully authorized federal law enforcement officer, a current/in-scope Tier 4 Background Investigation or a Tier 5 Single Scope Background Investigation, and no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct; or

3. A Transitioning Military Service Member, Veteran, or Member of the Reserves or National Guard who has at least four years of service in the military, no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct, and who holds or has held (within the past five years) a Secret, Top Secret, or Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information clearance and was not granted any waivers to obtain that clearance.

DHS values the demonstrated commitment and trustworthiness that these applicants bring to the mission, and the quality of vetting already performed at the state, local and Federal levels for these individuals in sensitive positions. Waivers will not be granted lightly as each criterion will be carefully vetted and reviewed to ensure verification.

DHS believes the flexibility to waive the polygraph for individuals in these limited populations would potentially expedite their onboarding and allow CBP to direct more resources toward the processing of other groups of applicants, preventing potential bottlenecks in the hiring pipeline. Additionally, the bills would retain the requirement for these specific applicants, like all CBP law enforcement applicants, to undergo a Tier 5 background investigation. Should derogatory information be detected during an applicant's background investigation, CBP may then choose to administer a polygraph examination.

DHS believes this approach enables CBP to weigh pre-employment risks and implement mitigation measures in order to improve its hiring capacity without lowering standards. By affording CBP the flexibility to waive the polygraph examination for eligible individuals in one of these categories, DHS believes CBP will be able to boost applicant numbers and the number of persons entering the academy to begin training. Additionally, retaining the requirement for all law enforcement applicants to undergo a Tier 5 background investigation (the highest level), coupled with random drug testing, periodic reinvestigation, and the continuous evaluation of employees for criminal conduct, will assist in mitigating any potential risk.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this letter to Congress.

I appreciate your support of DHS, and I look forward to working with you on this polygraph waiver legislation and future homeland security issues. I have sent identical letters of support to the Ranking Member of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, the Chair and Ranking Members of the House Committee on Homeland Security and its Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, whose Chairwoman introduced H.R. 2213, and Senator Flake who introduced S. 595.

Respectfully,

BENJAMIN CASSIDY,
Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs.

Ms. MCSALLY. Let me close with just this example.

I served in the Air Force for 26 years. In that time, I held a Top Secret/SCI clearance with access to compartmentalized programs as well, some of the most sensitive information that our government possesses. I was entrusted to fly a $12 million aircraft, command a squadron, run counterterrorism operations and combat search and rescue operations, retiring as a colonel, yet I have never taken a polygraph exam like the one required if I wanted to be a Border Patrol line agent after I retired, but I was subjected to periodic, very detailed background checks, background investigations, now called a tier 5 investigation, which is one that every single one of these agents and officers will also have to go through. It is a very invasive and thorough investigation. They talk to your neighbors, your coworkers, look in your financial records, your employers, you name it, to make sure that you are qualified.

So this example is a mismatch of public trust and it doesn't make any sense, and we need to give the CBP Commissioner discretion on a narrow case-by-case basis to fully vet applicants in the way that makes the most sense to fill these positions while preventing corruption.

I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, and especially my ranking member, Mr. VELA, for his support and work with us on this important bill.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I do not at all question the intentions of the proponents of this bill. I understand that the entire rationale is to expedite hiring because of the vast number of vacancies. I do, however, question the wisdom of this approach.

I think it is worth noting that, currently, two-thirds of the applicants for CBP fail the polygraph test; and that is important not as a barrier, but because that polygraph test reveals misconduct that makes them ineligible.

Now, the current Department of Homeland Security inspector general, John Roth, has expressed strong reservations about polygraph changes, the waivers, and, specifically, about these bills. He indicates that we need to identify other ways to make hiring more efficient ''without sacrificing integrity and effectiveness.'' And, in fact, the DHS OIG is currently auditing the CBP polygraph program, as is the GAO.

If you take a look at the bill, it allows for exemptions of the polygraph to certain categories of people, one of which is law enforcement officers who have undergone a polygraph examination as a condition of employment within the past 10 years. Well, you know, there was actually a Freedom of Information request on who flunked the polygraph tests in the CBP, and what has come out is that people who fall into this exemption admitted conduct that would make them ineligible, including child pornography, smuggling of drugs, theft.

It is fine to say that this would only be used when you knew that there wasn't a problem. The problem with that argument is sometimes you don't find out what the problem is until you subject the applicant to a polygraph or they know that they are about to be subjected to a polygraph, in which case, they own up.

So the Border Patrol is to be honored; they do a great job for us. But we know that the Sinaloa drug cartel is trying to recruit applicants. The last thing we need is for them to succeed, for our sake as well as for our brave men and women in the Border Patrol.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about standing up for Border Patrol cops. Border Patrol is woefully undermanned. This bill addresses this serious issue. In order to stand strong against jihadist terror and cartel organized crime, we

must have an adequate number of boots on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, I served my community for many, many years as a street cop. I know exactly what it is to work patrol under dangerous, exhausting conditions. My Border Patrol brothers and sisters of the thin blue line are stretched too thin.

Hear my words: These are high caliber law enforcement professionals, but they are well below the staffing levels mandated by Congress.

This bill is not about lowering standards, as some critics claim. To the contrary, this bill allows for a commonsense approach to hire experienced, highly qualified patriots to fill the ranks of our front lines. This bill allows reasonable degrees of discretion that streamline the vetting and hiring process at Customs and Border Patrol.

I would like to thank Chairwoman MCSALLY for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the law enforcement community and vote in favor of this important legislation.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I had the benefit, of course, of hearing my colleague, Congresswoman LOFGREN, and I appreciate my colleagues on the other side because, agreed, we all want there to be the right sort of national security protections at the border, but we want to make sure that we are maximizing those opportunities and recognize that there has been an issue of being able to address the shortage of officers. But to address a workforce shortage by minimizing the very requirements that not only preserve our national security and protect the men and women at our border, I would agree, is not the way that we should be proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I rise in opposition to the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act. As a Member from a border State that heavily trades with Mexico, I certainly understand the value of having sufficient customs officials manning our ports of entry and agents protecting our border; but eliminating the critical polygraph requirements for certain CBP applicants only undermines our Nation's safety, given this agency's historic connection to organized crime, drug cartels, and corruption.

The DHS inspector general has warned that weakening CBP polygraph requirements would make our southern border more vulnerable and that we should, instead, identify ways to make hiring more efficient without sacrificing integrity and effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I live in a community that the FBI has now identified as one of the most dangerous cities in the country, Albuquerque, New Mexico, primarily because of the drug cartel. The drug trade in our city and in our State is significant, so we understand having sufficient officers.

While I strongly oppose this bill, I am committed to working with my colleagues and CBP to identify solutions that won't jeopardize national security.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the preamble of the Constitution, our Founding Fathers explained a more perfect Union required the Federal Government to do a few things, and to do them well. At the top of the list is the Federal Government's responsibility to provide for the common defense and secure our freedom.

There is no freedom without security. These concepts, these pillars upon which this great Nation was founded, must be proactively protected every day by men and women across this Nation. A select few of those men and women wake up every morning to patrol and protect our sovereign Nation's border in the face of drug smuggling, human trafficking, and violent criminal activity.

□ 1530

They work to safeguard our Nation, enforce the rule of law, and promote free trade and commerce through our ports of entry. Yet the previous administration's policy left our Border Patrol and Customs operations hamstrung and significantly understaffed.

As someone who represents a border State, I have seen and experienced those vulnerabilities firsthand.

To say that our Border Patrol and Customs operations are woefully understaffed is woefully understated. We are almost 3,000 officers and agents short of the minimum that is mandated by Congress. One reason for this understaffing is the unreasonable and protracted hiring processes.

In 2015, it took more than 460 days, on average, and 11 separate steps to hire a new officer or agent. This is absolutely absurd, even by government standards, and it must be fixed. That is why today I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 2213. This legislation provides a more commonsense and expeditious process for hiring border personnel.

We also need enough Customs officers to foster efficient trade for a robust economy. A recent study found that every batch of 33 CBP officers hired could lead to an increase in GDP of $60 million and an employment gain of over 1,000 jobs. For too long, the Federal Government has abdicated its chief responsibility of securing our borders and protecting our citizens. We must put the safety and security of the American people first and give our Border Patrol and the CBP the staff they need to do their job.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2213, and I applaud Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member VELA, and Representative MCSALLY for their leadership on this critical issue.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

This legislation aims to address a staffing issue that has plagued the United States Customs and Border Patrol for many years.

H.R. 2213 would add the option to waive the polygraph test for a select few individuals who have already successfully taken and passed a similar polygraph test in the past. These individuals are veterans, members of our Armed Forces, or law enforcement officers with clean records and years of honorable service.

A veteran with secret clearance and an honorable discharge, 3 years of service, and a tier 5 background check is someone I would hold in high regard and exempt from an unnecessary polygraph.

I would not be in favor of this bill if it was exempting a polygraph test to the general public. This is a special group—our veterans and our law enforcement.

This legislation would not change the United States Customs and Border Patrol requirements for background checks or interviews. Customs and Border Patrol would still have their candidates undergo the regular battery of tests and checks. Customs and Border Patrol would still ask a candidate who waived the polygraph under these proposed changes to take the examination. This bill will not lower the standards for entry. Rather, the flexibility it provides would prevent potential bottlenecks in the hiring pipelines and eliminate redundancy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to appease the concerns of several of my colleagues and say that this is not about building up a deportation force. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reaffirm that this legislation exclusively applies to Customs and Border Patrol, and it will not change the hiring procedures for Immigration and Customs Enforcement. This bill is about ensuring the agency hires only the best and the most honorable candidates. This bill is about providing employment and advancement opportunities for our servicemembers and law enforcement and creating job opportunities for those living in our border communities and border States.

Mr. Speaker, I also live in a border community, and I support this bill.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), the chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this polygraph waiver provision that is proposed here is a darn good idea that is a long time overdue from happening. The reality is the hiring process of the Border Patrol, and, in fact, I would argue almost everything under my jurisdiction in Homeland Security, is as slow as molasses in the wintertime. It just doesn't move.

Meanwhile, we have got skilled law enforcement people applying, skilled former veterans with high clearances who are applying for these jobs and being stumbled by the lack of polygraph operators available to do it.

This is a choice and a right choice of setting a priority for those people who have served, proving their worth, and are asking to be part of the defense of our national borders. I support this wholeheartedly. I support Chairwoman MCSALLY's concept here. It is great. It starts a new way of doing things. We need more than anything else in the Federal Government—if a new way of doing things is the right way, we ought to be doing it. Nobody is going to keep from checking on people. You can still make them take a polygraph if you run across something you don't like. But it is a good idea whose time has come. Let's be modern Americans and have new ideas and make those new ideas work.

I commend everyone here in support of this. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I think, for a change, government is making a good start at new ideas.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I will not mince words. Anyone who votes for this bill is voting to support and implement Donald Trump's views on immigration, his desire to militarize our southern border, and his fantasy of a mass deportation force. You cannot spin it any other way.

If we want to lower the standards for screening and hiring CBP officers, eliminate checks that could help weed out candidates with criminal histories or criminal intentions, and water down the integrity of this important national security source, this bill is for you.

But if you care about border security and the integrity of the officers, you should join me in voting against the bill.

To me and a lot of other people watching this debate, this is about something else. Remember that man descending the golden escalators at Trump Tower announcing his campaign for President by saying Mexicans who come to the U.S. are rapists, drug dealers, and murderers? Remember him? Do you want to buy into his vision of immigrants as a brown horde intent on doing America harm?

If you are onboard with this, you are also onboard with building a wall; onboard with billions to be spent on deporting moms and dads who have lived here for decades; going after DREAMers as the Trump administration is doing today, deporting DREAMers from the United States of America. Where do you want to draw the line on the Trump deportation agenda? I say draw the line right here, right now, and don't give another inch. There are many ways to secure the Nation, but watering down the hiring standards of our men and women in uniform should not be one of them. Let's secure the border. Let's have them have the same test at the border that you have a DEA agent, FBI agent, Secret Service agent. What are we going to do? Not have them take polygraph tests? That is going to make America safe. I doubt it.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative VELA for yielding time to me and also Chairman MCCAUL and the folks who have been working on this particular bill.

CBP currently has a staffing deficit of 3,000 individuals for the uniform components, that is the U.S. Border Patrol, Office of Field Operations, Air and Marine Operations, which jeopardizes our national and our economic security.

This legislation does not cover ICE. CBP, Border Patrol, and Air and Marine. Nobody else. This has nothing to do with deportation.

Long before President Trump became a candidate for the office, Congress authorized CBP to hire an additional 2,000 officers. That was about 4 years ago. Chairman CARTER, MICHAEL MCCAUL, we authorized 2,000 officers. Up to now, Mr. Speaker, we have not been able to hire those 2,000 officers because of the polygraph exam.

In fact, 65 percent of those individuals who applied for CBP are rejected, which is twice the amount that you have for other Federal officers, FBI, DEA, when they take their polygraph. I am talking about polygraph exams.

Again, this does not cover ICE. What this bill actually does, it will strengthen CBP's efforts to secure our border by filling those positions. I represent Laredo, the largest inland port, 14,000 traders a day. They have been delayed because we don't have enough CBP officers, and we need to get them.

What this bill does, it does not lower the standards. I emphasize, it does not lower the standards. It streamlines the background investigation for a limited number of veterans, military officers, law enforcement. If you are a local law enforcement and you take a polygraph exam, then you can ask for this waiver. Or if you are a servicemember or a veteran with the highest background investigation, you can get a waiver. Or if you are current Federal law enforcement with the highest background exam, you can get a waiver. But, again, if somebody finds out those vetted individuals still need to take a polygraph, then you would take it.

Finally, the last thing to conclude is, Members, this is not the first time we have gotten a waiver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VELA. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CUELLAR. If you look at the National Defense Authorization polygraph waiver language, CBP has already gotten requests for waivers. In fact, it has already been done. This is not the first time that we are doing this. It is already the law. It doesn't bring down the standards. It allows us to have more men and women at the border, and this is why I ask you to support this legislation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017, aims to bring some relief to the tremendous staffing shortages at our ports of entry by providing CBP with limited authority to waive its polygraph requirement on a case-by-case basis for certain veterans and State and local law enforcement officers in its hiring process.

H.R. 2213 is endorsed by the NTEU, the union that represents frontline CBP officers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding this debate, it is important to note this bill is a bipartisan effort, passing unanimously out of my committee. It is supported by Ranking Member THOMPSON, Congressman VELA, and we thank you for that, and others. Again, it passed out unanimously.

I was pleased to see also a Dear Colleague letter sent by my Democratic counterparts on the Homeland Security Committee urging the passage of this bill. This only further underscores the bipartisan nature of this effort.

It is also supported, Mr. Speaker, by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Border Trade Alliance, the CBP officers' union, and the Fraternal Order of Police, among others.

The issue is very clear. Not passing this bill will continue to keep American families at risk from dangers of human traffickers, drug smugglers, and international terrorists. Right now, we simply don't have an adequate number of Border Patrol agents and CBP officers to safeguard our Nation's border. We need to fix that. That is what this legislation does. It will allow us to bolster our forces with talented law enforcement officials and military personnel who have been previously vetted and have already demonstrated their commitment and patriotism to their fellow Americans.

□ 1545

As I have stated before, while new infrastructure and technology will be important in protecting this Nation, the brave men and women who confront threats to our homeland are our greatest assets.

Once again, I thank Congresswoman MCSALLY, Ranking Members VELA and

THOMPSON, and all those who supported this bill. It will help strengthen our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I will be unable to vote today on H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act. If I would be present, I would vote against the bill.

While this bill purports to fast track the hiring of Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) agents in order to ensure our national security, it would actually water down hiring practices and allow potential vulnerabilities in the country's largest law enforcement agency. H.R. 2213 would allow certain CBP applicants to bypass polygraph testing.

In 2010 Congress passed the Anti-Border Corruption Act, which mandated CBP applicants pass a polygraph test as part of their hiring process. This bill was an essential step after an influx of corruption cases were revealed within the agency—ranging from drug trafficking to accepting bribes. Decreasing hiring standards as proposed by H.R. 2213 would do exactly what the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 fixed.

Instead of finding common-sense ways to expedite the hiring process without compromising the integrity of the agency, H.R. 2213 irresponsibly cuts corners in an attempt to keep President Trump's campaign promises of quickly increasing border patrol agents.

I am absolutely committed to regaining control of our country's borders and have continually fought to restrict individuals who would do our citizens harm—both through terrorist attacks or drug smuggling—from entering the United States. This ill-conceived legislation does nothing to ensure increased border security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the later of the following dates:

(1) The date on which all of the following have been completed:

(A) The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection has conducted an evaluation and pilot program of the Test for Espionage, Sabotage, and Corruption (TES-C).

(B) The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security has certified such evaluation and pilot program.

(C) The Commissioner submits to Congress a report on such evaluation and pilot program.

(2) The date on which the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security completes a risk assessment of the population of individuals who could receive waivers under section 3(b) of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010, as amended by this Act, and submits to Congress certification that providing waivers to such individuals would not endanger national security, undermine workforce integrity, or increase corruption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 374, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this is, in fact, a national security issue. No other Federal law enforcement agency in the country—not the FBI, DEA, ATF, or Secret Service—makes any exceptions to their polygraph exam.

I understand that the CBP has a staffing shortage, but watering down vetting standards is dangerous and could lead to more corruption at the largest law enforcement agency in the country. In fact, 2,170 CBP personnel were arrested for sexual assault, excessive force, conspiring with international drug trafficking organizations, and other offenses between 2005 and 2012.

In response, Congress enacted legislation to require every applicant to undergo a polygraph exam—no exceptions. DHS' own Integrity Advisory Panel and the GAO have both recommended that the current polygraph testing be expanded, not reduced, given the higher rates of corruption at CBP than any other Federal law enforcement agency.

This bill takes us backward, and some current and former DHS officials have expressed concerns that the bill could expose the agency to corrupt individuals who could undermine the integrity of the workforce.

DHS Inspector General John Roth warned that the proposed legislation ''could put CBP at significant risk and that while it may sound reasonable to say you could waive requirements from former military personnel because they have passed a polygraph, Border Patrol agents work in a different environment that is not as controlled as the military.''

Former CBP head of Internal Affairs has stated that ''very few members of the military take polygraphs or have comprehensive background checks, and the quality of State or local law enforcement polygraphs varies widely.''

My amendment would delay the implementation of the bill until, one, CBP completes its ongoing pilot program of an alternative polygraph test that may help speed up hiring while maintaining vetting standards; and, two, the DHS inspector general determines that the bill would not endanger our national security, undermine workforce integrity, or, in fact, increase corruption.

I recognize that CBP is managing hiring and staffing issues. Passing this bill without knowing its potential risks or consequences is not only shortsighted, but I think it is irresponsible. We shouldn't blindly experiment with our Nation's security given that drugs, weapons, and human trafficking, as well as terrorism, are all threats we are facing at the border.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes'' for my amendment to help safeguard national security and protect the integrity of the CBP and its officers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico for yielding. I appreciate her leadership on this issue, and, as a cosponsor, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Our Customs and Border Patrol officers face a difficult mission in an extremely challenging environment. Polygraph testing is an important tool to ensure those charged with patrolling our border are not corruptible by drug traffickers or other criminal elements.

I am sympathetic to the hiring and staffing challenges facing this agency, but we cannot cut corners or jeopardize the security of our border.

This amendment delays the implementation of this legislation until CBP can complete its ongoing test of an alternative, more efficient polygraph test.

This amendment also requires DHS determine these changes in the underlying bill to our polygraph procedures do not endanger our national security.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to ensure we do not create unnecessary risks to the security of our border.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good solution to the dilemma that faces us. We do have a hiring deficit in the Border Patrol, but we cannot give up on the need to fully vet these people.

The independent inspector said that the polygraphs had stopped dozens of applicants who have admitted to participation in human trafficking, defrauding the government, and have links with cartels intent to infiltrate CBP.

There has been, actually, a release from the Freedom of Information Act of people who would be eligible for the exemption who admitted, under the polygraph, to sexual assault, to child pornography, to taking classified information from Afghanistan, to taking classified information from Iraq, a sheriff's employee who engaged in theft, and a police officer who was a smuggler. The Border Patrol cannot afford this.

I think the gentlewoman's amendment actually preserves what we want, and I would highly recommend that we approve it.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Lujan Grisham amendment.

Let me say, first, that the Secretary of Homeland Security testified before my committee this morning, a decorated four-star general serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. He is the head of SOUTHCOM. This man knows the border. Secretary Kelly supports this legislation.

I find it a bit offensive that decorated veterans who have already received clearances somehow would present a threat to the security of the United States, so I reject that argument.

This amendment strikes me as an unnecessary and harmful delay tactic that would prevent CBP from implementing the much-needed flexibility provided for in the underlying bill.

If the delays called for in this amendment were put in place, CBP would have to sit and wait until certain unnecessary obstacles were overcome, some of which are completely out of their control. All the while, they would continue to hemorrhage officers and agents, threatening the Nation's border security and the flow of commerce in and out of the country. This could put our national security at risk and would be, further, detrimental to the flow of legitimate trade and travel.

CBP has missed hiring targets for Border Patrol agents for 4 years and CBP officers for almost 18 months. We need additional officers and agents now, simply to meet the congressionally mandated CBP staffing levels that have been put in place for a year. We cannot wait for more reports and evaluations.

Sadly, this amendment looks to me like an attempt by opponents of the bill to prevent the important provisions of this bill from going into effect in a timely manner, thus preventing the hiring of already trusted and vetted individuals who have served their Nation and the military with honor and distinction.

It is also important to underscore two points here: one, that all applicants will continue to be fully vetted, including a rigorous tier 5 background investigation, which is equivalent to the investigation performed for all servicemembers who hold a top secret clearance; and second, the authority granted under this bill is discretionary. If the CBP Commissioner wishes to require a polygraph examination for any applicant for any reason, he can and should still do so.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to wait any longer. As the Speaker knows, who is briefed on the threats, as do I, in a classified setting, the threats are real. This Nation is at risk, and we cannot afford to wait.

So, for these reasons, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Let me just close, again, by saying I oppose the amendment. The men and women wearing the uniform on the front lines of our ports and borders need relief now, and any delay tactics should be rejected. Therefore, I urge opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House that was previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately release his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has a responsibility to hold the Executive Branch of government to a fair and equal standard of transparency ensuring the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline of reasonable information including whether the President paid taxes, ownership interests, charitable donations made, and whether tax deductions have been exploited;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President recently fired Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, under whose leadership the FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, President Trump reportedly stated to Russian officials during a White House meeting that he fired Director Comey to ease pressure on the ongoing investigation of Russia's influence in the 2016 election;

Whereas, Senate Russia investigators have requested information from the Treasury Department's criminal investigation division, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, which handles cases of money laundering, for information related to President Trump, his top officials and campaign aides. FinCEN has been investigating allegations of foreign money-laundering through purchases of U.S. real estate;

Whereas, the President's tax returns would show us whether he has foreign bank accounts and how much profit he receives from his ownership in myriad partnerships;

Whereas, Donald Trump Jr. said the Trump Organization saw money ''pouring in from Russia'' and that ''Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets.''

Whereas, Congress gave itself the authority to review an individual's tax returns to investigate and reveal possible conflicts of interest of executive branch officials involved dating back to the Teapot Dome scandal.

Whereas, it has been reported that federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian involvement in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses; and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution for the express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any ''present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state'';

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President's tax returns under Section 6103 of the tax code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas Director Comey has testified that tax returns are a common tool in investigations because they can show income and motives;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives shall—

1. Immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives.

2. Support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Does the gentleman from Massachusetts wish to present argument on the parliamentary question whether the resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. CAPUANO. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the question of order.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, the privileges of the House as defined in rule IX, clause 1 are ''those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.''

We all know what has been going on for the last couple of months. In light of the testimony that was just released today of former Director Comey and what he is scheduled to say, his written testimony tomorrow, if it is not clear by now that the Congress should continue its investigation—as we speak, we have several committees in this Congress investigating the Russian influence on our election and what its relationship is with the Trump administration.

Clearly and unequivocally, one of the questions that must be answered for the integrity of this investigation and, therefore, the integrity of the House, is whether the President himself had any undue influence in his actions.

Now, the answer may be ''no,'' and I personally hope that it is ''no.'' I have no personal reason to want to have the President do something wrong.

But, at the same time, we, the American people, have a right to know the answer that our President has not been subject to undue influence. And as a Member of Congress, we have a responsibility to our constituents to provide them those answers.

The investigations are ongoing. At some point, it is unquestioned that the President's tax returns will become relevant to what the FBI is doing. It is only a matter of time.

For the integrity of the House, for the dignity of the House, I believe firmly that we should exercise the law that the Congress put in place itself to do our own due diligent investigation and not just simply sit on our hands while others do our work for us.

These documents will become public, and when they do, regardless of what they show, I believe firmly it will reflect negatively on this House for not having done our duty, for having shirked our responsibilities. That is why I believe this is a privilege of the House. That is why I believe this House should take this action.

And again, I hope we find nothing. That would be good for America, certainly good for Mr. Trump, good for America. We have plenty of other things to argue about and debate. This shouldn't be one of them.

And if anybody can look me in the face and say that they believe this investigation is just going to go away, if they believe the investigators are not going to look at the President's financial records, they can't because anybody who has ever been involved in any type of an investigation knows it is inevitable. And since it is inevitable, why should we wait? Why should we wait?

I ran for office, taking an oath to uphold the Constitution and giving my constituents my promise of only one thing: I will do my job as best as I see fit. I won't shirk my responsibilities.

We have plenty of votes in this House that many of us, including me, would rather not take because they are uncomfortable, because we have to explain them to our constituents, because sometimes they are difficult and confusing. This is not one of them.

There aren't any Americans that don't believe they have a right to know that their President has not been subject to undue influence. That is all this does. It draws no conclusion from it, and it allows the majority party to call on it to make the determination; not me, but the majority party; the chair of the Ways and Means Committee.

That is why I offered this resolution. That is why I think this resolution is going to continue to be offered, and, at some point, the House is going to do it. I don't know why Members of the House want to drag this out and pretend that somehow you are going to be able to avoid it. You are not. It is going to happen.

With that, I would like to invite my friend, Mr. PASCRELL, to say a few words. He has been the leader on this particular issue for months now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear each Member individually.

Does any other Member wish to be heard on the question of order?

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized on the question of order.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, just when you think you heard it all, you haven't. And as my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) just pointed out, what we need to do is uphold the integrity of this body, the legislative branch of government.

Now, just a brief review, because I have about 2,000 pages of reference. We are not going to go into that all tonight, but if you will allow me, I will go into some of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does this pertain to the question of order?

Mr. PASCRELL. Yes, sir.

We started out on February 1. We have had a letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. We have had an amendment in the Ways and Means Committee, which is one of the three committees under 6103, paragraph F, section 1 of the Tax Code, written in 1924, that allows the Ways and Means Committee, along with the Senate Finance Committee, along with the Joint Committee on Taxation, to do its due diligence.

We have had one, two, three, four, five, six, seven privileged resolutions. Mr. CAPUANO has offered tonight's privileged resolution.

We have had a resolution, two resolutions of inquiry through the Ways and Means Committee—just having a little review here of what we have done. We have debated all of these. They must have all been in order.

And we have a discharge petition right now before the Congress of the United States, and if we get to 218 in that discharge petition, we will have to take another vote. As Mr. CAPUANO pointed out, there are a lot of votes that we don't like to take, but these are votes that are necessary, Mr. Speaker.

Already, two dozen Members of the majority party at town meetings have said, yes, the President should give the public, or at least the committees, first of all, his tax returns.

We are not talking about a 1040. We are talking about thousands of pages that go into a businessperson's, who is a billion-, zillionaire, whatever the heck he is, that is what it takes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the question of order; whether the proposed resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. PASCRELL. Oh, I think this is a privilege of the House, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not to the merits of the resolution.

Mr. PASCRELL. Right. I understand that. I understand that. Thank you for pointing that out.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you know who Walter Shaub is. S-H-A-U-B. Walter Shaub is the Director of the United States Office of Government Ethics. That is pretty important. In fact, in the last administration—talk about the privilege of the House—this is the document that was presented on June 21, the day after inauguration, 2009, the Ethics Commitments by the Executive Branch of Personnel.

This document goes into such things as the revolving door ban on lobbyists or pertaining to the executive branch of government because that is what we are talking about.

Just when you think you have heard it all, you haven't.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, this administration threw out there in a trial balloon that we are going to start to sell off——

Is there a problem? Is there a problem?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the question of order.

Mr. PASCRELL. That is correct. That is exactly what I am doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is wandering far from the question of order.

Mr. PASCRELL. I never wander, Mr. Speaker. I may not stick to the subject, but I don't wander.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in the wilderness.

Mr. PASCRELL. No, I am not. I am not in Idaho.

The fact of the matter is, this is a very specific document that each administration presents when it is sworn. This is the set of rules which govern the executive branch of government.

When I read in documentation that we are getting set to sell off public lands, what am I reminded of?

Talk about the integrity of the House of Representatives. What am I reminded of?

I am reminded of what happened in 1922, 1923, 1924, when they tried to sell

off oil reserves, and it got them into trouble. Republicans had their hands out. Democrats had their hands out, which led, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Massachusetts seeks to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

As the Chair most recently ruled on May 24, 2017, the resolution directs the Committee on Ways and Means to meet and consider an item of business under the procedures set forth in 26 U.S.C. 6103 and, therefore, does not qualify as a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCaul moves that the appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2213 and passage of H.R. 2213, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 186, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

YEAS—228

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt
Babin
Brady (TX)
Clyburn
Cummings
DeFazio
Engel
Grothman
Jackson Lee
Johnson, Sam
Marino
Napolitano
Reichert
Richmond
Smith (TX)

□ 1639

Messrs. YARMUTH, CONYERS, and GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 292, I was unavoidably detained to cast my vote in time. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CONGRESSIONAL SHOOT-OUT AND INDUSTRY CHALLENGE

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus—the largest bipartisan caucus within the Halls of Congress—to talk about the recent May 16 congressional shoot-out, a competition of sporting clays, skeet, and trap that pit Republican and Democrat Members of Congress against each other in a great afternoon of enjoying outdoor shooting sports.

We had a bipartisan shoot. The Republican team won this year. I am just the chairman and team captain.

I would like to say that I won one of the individual awards this year—I have in the past—but this year we had Members on our side that won. The top gun Member of Congress was RICHARD HUDSON from North Carolina. The top shot Democrat was TIM WALZ. The best shooter for skeet was COLLIN PETERSON. The top sporting clays was a freshman Member from North Carolina, TED BUDD. I am saving the best for last: the top trap was none other than DON YOUNG from Alaska.

It is a great afternoon where we can honor the outdoor economy, the largest industry of the United States, serve the outdoors in a lot of ways, and the heritage of sportsmen outdoor community activity is critical to the American story.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), who is the Democrat co-chair.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have had this competitive shoot for a number of years, and I have to admit, this year I had a job fair at home, so I am going to turn it over to my vice chair, MARC VEASEY, who was actually out there. It is a great competition between the Republicans and the Democrats, but we work together on a lot of other issues.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Houston, Representative GREEN, and I also thank the Republicans that participate in the shoot every year. Obviously, we all play to win every time and we take the competition very seriously. Democrats only lost by about 13 shots this year. We actually did pretty good. So we are improving.

I want to remind everybody that we work on issues like conservation, environmental issues, and other things where Democrats and Republicans can come together for the greater cause of the country. I want to remind the gentleman that next year we are going to find those 13 shots.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), who is MARC VEASEY's co-chair on the caucus.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague that those shots were in my bag and on our side.

We are going to win again next year. We always enjoy the friendship, and I look forward to seeing the gentleman again out there and standing up for the rights of sportsmen. I certainly appreciate his friendship and look forward to traveling again with him.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. What a great event. It was a great opportunity for us to get together, get to know each other better, and spend some time in the outdoors.

I invite all Members to join the caucus. Come and be a part of this next year. Republicans retain the trophy this year, and I hope we will next year.

ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adopting amendment No. 1 to the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—179

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—238

Abraham
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Babin
Brady (TX)
Clyburn
Cummings
DeFazio
Engel
Jackson Lee
Johnson, Sam
Marino
Napolitano
Reichert
Smith (TX)

□ 1652

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. PETERS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 293, I was unavoidably detained to cast my vote in time. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLUMENAUER was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR PORTLAND VICTIMS

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, May 26 was a dark moment in my community, as a hateful tirade toward two young women, evidently based on their race and faith, led to tragedy.

In the face of this menacing behavior, three brave Portlanders intervened to protect these young women. Two lost their lives, another had his throat slashed. They were Ricky Best, Taliesin Myrddin Namkai-Meche, and Micah David-Cole Fletcher. Micah

David-Cole Fletcher survived the ordeal, still expressing hope and compassion.

That dark moment and bright example of courage and compassion has prompted soul-searching in my community. There has been a tremendous outpouring of support and a commitment to help the vulnerable. We all think about whether we would have had that courage.

Who knows what might have happened to those two young women if those courageous people had not intervened. Based on what happened, it is highly likely that they would have been physically assaulted, injured, or worse.

We think this is a wake-up call for all of us to protect the vulnerable, to resist intolerance, and to condemn behaviors and language that would incite violent behavior. We all have a stake in this so that we don't have more victims and that these three brave people's sacrifice was not in vain.

I respectfully request the Chamber observe a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 137, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—282

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Cleaver
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—137

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
Norcross
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Babin
Clyburn
Cummings
DeFazio
Engel
Johnson, Sam
Marino
Napolitano
Reichert
Smith (TX)

□ 1706

Mr. SCHNEIDER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on June 7, 2017 on account of attending my son's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "yea" for rollcall vote No. 288, "yea" for rollcall vote No. 289, "yea" for rollcall vote No. 290, "yea" for rollcall vote No. 291, "yea" for rollcall vote No. 292, "yea" for rollcall vote No. 293, and "yea" for rollcall vote No. 294.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 292, No. 293, and No. 294 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair. I also would have voted "yea" on the Lujan Grisham Amendment. I also would have voted "nay" on Final Passage of H.R. 2213—Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was delayed with constituency matters in a hearing and was not able to be present on the floor on the vote on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair. If I had been present, I would have voted ''no.''

I was also detained on congressional business in a hearing on the Lujan Grisham amendment to H.R. 2213. If I had been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2560

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 2560.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING LOCAL HERO THALIA RODRIGUEZ

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a young and valiant member of our south Florida community, Thalia Rodriguez. Just 17 years old, Thalia used her skills that she learned from her high school's emergency medical responder class to save the life of one of our Miami-Dade police officers.

Major Ricky Carter was off duty, traveling on his motorcycle, when an unexpected crash left him critically injured at the side of the road. Thalia came upon the scene, immediately began to apply first aid to the injured police major. Realizing that his injuries were too severe to wait for the first responders to arrive, Thalia made the split-second decision to fashion a tourniquet out of a belt, thereby buying Major Carter precious time. Thalia's brave act that Sunday morning saved Major Ricky Carter's life.

Thank you to Thalia Rodriguez, a graduating senior at Westland Hialeah Senior High School, for her outstanding heroism.

CELEBRATING LADY BETTY COLES

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and celebrate the 90th birthday of Lady Betty Coles of Trenton, New Jersey. She was wonderfully celebrated this weekend at a party attended by over 100 family members and friends, thanks to her daughter and son-in-law, Tracy and Robert Ross.

Lady Coles has distinguished her family, church, and community with countless years of dedicated service, love, and leadership by example. She has enriched our community as charter member of the Epsilon Upsilon Omega Chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha since 1952, and continues her years of service as a member of Shiloh Baptist Church.

Personally, I am grateful for her friendship, her stewardship, her mentorship, her leadership, and her dedication to not only New Jersey, but our global community.

May God continue to bless Lady Coles on this milestone year, and we are forever grateful to Him, having sent her our way.

BRINGING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY TO ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Financial CHOICE Act. Financial Services Committee Chairman JEB HENSARLING's bill aims to bring economic opportunity to all Americans.

After Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats passed the Dodd-Frank Act of 2010, dozens of small community financial institutions in my district were forced to close or merge with big banks. In fact, my State of Georgia has lost more than 40 of these institutions over this period of time. This was due to the unbelievable complexity and compliance costs of the regulations imposed on them.

With the Financial CHOICE Act, community banks will finally be able to get some relief from these regulations. As a businessowner myself, I know how important access to capital can be for a new business. We know that 70 percent of all new job creation is created by the growth of small business.

Once these banks are able to get back to the business of lending, my hope is that it will spur small-business growth and entrepreneurship in my district and across this great Nation.

This legislation also ends taxpayer-funded bailouts once and for all, finally fulfilling the promises that Democrats failed to keep.

And did I mention it reduces the deficit by $33.6 billion over 10 years?

President Trump has asked us to do a number on Dodd-Frank, and I support him in this endeavor, and believe the Financial CHOICE Act does just that.

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today, President Trump visited Ohio to tout his infrastructure plan. Well, Ohio needs the good jobs that direct national investment in infrastructure could provide, so my Democratic Ohio colleagues, Mr. RYAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, and I sent President Trump a letter encouraging him to take a wide view of what infrastructure should encompass in States like Ohio.

We urged the President to consider upgrading our foundational assets, such as drinking water systems, our national electric grid, energy efficiency, roofing and lead removal in individual homes, plus modernizing roads and bridges, our seaports and waterways, our airports and rail systems. Indeed, infrastructure investments present the best opportunity to revitalize our battered domestic steel industry as well.

We hope President Trump's infrastructure plan won't lead to more broken promises like with his budget, which zeros out assistance for our Great Lakes. The President's plan lacks quantifiable specifics, but some warning signs are there. Privatization and tax breaks mean bearing down more costs on taxpayers through user fees and tolls.

Mr. Speaker, Americans expect more than showmanship. It is time for a real bipartisan jobs and infrastructure plan to help modernize America from stem to stern and keep her great for years to come.

CONGRATULATING DEAN WILLIAM EASTERLING

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Penn State's own Dean William Easterling on his appointment to head the National Science Foundation's Directorate for Geosciences, or GEO.

Dr. Easterling was dean of Penn State College of Earth and Mineral Sciences prior to beginning his 4-year appointment last week. This is an incredible opportunity for Dean Easterling, and Happy Valley is most proud of his achievement.

Science was part of Dean Easterling's life from a very young age, as his father was a medical school physician. He told our local newspaper that he was taken at an early age by environmental sciences, geology, and weather, and these interests have always stuck with him.

Dr. Easterling has been the dean of Earth and Mineral Sciences at Penn State since 2007. He plans to return to the university after his appointment to the National Science Foundation.

I wholeheartedly congratulate Dean Easterling on this momentous achievement. I wish him the best over the next 4 years. And I know that his hunger for learning and his advanced research skills will serve this Nation well.

Congratulations, Dean Easterling.

□ 1715

DISAPPROVING OF WITHDRAWAL FROM THE PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong disapproval of President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the international Paris Agreement on global climate change. The world is watching us, and history will judge this ill-considered decision harshly.

Withdrawing from the accord weakens America's global leadership, will slow our transition to renewable sources of energy, and make it more likely the clean energy jobs of tomorrow will be created overseas rather than here at home.

Let me be clear: Climate change is real and a present threat. America can and should be the global leader in developing innovative solutions, but this decision leaves us as an international outlier.

I am proud my hometown, Chicago, joins cities and States across the country that have pledged to continue honoring the emission reductions that are part of the Paris Agreement. That is why I am introducing a resolution to commend these States and localities and to urge the administration to reverse its position.

I invite my colleagues to join me. Irrespective of President Trump's shortsighted policies, we must continue to seek solutions to protect our planet for future generations.

IN MEMORIAM OF SPECIALIST ETIENNE J. MURPHY

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Army Specialist Etienne J. Murphy, who died on May 26 when his vehicle overturned in Syria as part of Operation Inherent Resolve.

Specialist Murphy was raised in Loganville, Georgia, where, from an early age, he showed a keen interest in the American Armed Forces and for serving his country. He enlisted in the Army at 18 years old, and 2 years later he joined the 1st Battalion of the 75th Ranger Regiment, stationed at Hunter Army Airfield.

Murphy was just 5 days into his first deployment in Syria when his vehicle was involved in a nontactical rollover-related accident which is still under investigation.

Murphy's wife and two young sons continue to reside in Savannah, Georgia, where he was stationed.

Only a short time after Memorial Day, Specialist Murphy's passing reminds us all that freedom comes at a high price, and servicemen and -women face danger daily when fighting to preserve American values against terrorism.

I want to share my deepest condolences to his family and thank Specialist Murphy for his service, bravery, and sacrifice.

JAMES COMEY WILL TESTIFY

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning James Comey will address the Senate Intelligence Committee. I read his testimony today.

It is obvious to me that the President leaned on James Comey to try to get him to take actions in the Michael Flynn situation that were contrary to what Mr. Comey and I think justice would require, and that is an open investigation for the benefit of the American people and for the independence of the American Government in dealing with its relations with Russia.

I commend James Comey for being strong after being looked down on and at by the President, trying to get him to ask for his job or pledge loyalty or commit to derail that investigation.

I thank him for his integrity. I thank him for his service to the FBI. And I certainly hope that no one will try to disparage his integrity or his honesty tomorrow.

LORAL O'HARA IS A MEMBER OF 2017 NASA ASTRONAUT CANDIDATE CLASS

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Sugar Land, Texas, is bursting with pride. A few hours ago, at the Johnson Space Center, Vice President PENCE announced that Loral O'Hara is a member of the 2017 NASA astronaut candidate class.

She is a native Texan. Her high school is in my neighborhood. She is a proud Clements High School Ranger, class of 2001. She has a bachelor's from a school in the former Republic of Texas, the University of Kansas, and a master's from Purdue University.

Growing up with astronauts, I know they like to take lots of huge risks, and by that standard, Loral is the most qualified candidate ever. She is a private pilot, an EMT, a wilderness first responder, a surfer, a sailor, a skier.

Currently, she works at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Center. That is perfect training for her because she will spend hours in the water at the Sonny Carter Neutral Buoyancy Lab outside the Johnson Space Center.

Loral, you know how to come home in style like only a Texas woman can do. You are an astronaut. Welcome home.

NATIONAL CANCER SURVIVORS DAY

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago on June 4, we recognized National Cancer Survivors Day to honor all of the incredible men and women who have battled cancer and have emerged triumphant.

This year, an estimated 1.6 million new cases of cancer will be diagnosed, and nearly 700,000 people will die of cancer in the United States.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention lists cancer now as the second leading cause of death. Fortunately, we are taking steps to lower those numbers. Last year's 21st Century Cures Act, a bipartisan initiative, authorized $1.8 billion in funding for the Cancer Moonshot Foundation, aids in cancer research, and strives to increase the availability of a wide variety of treatment options while also helping to help prevent cancer and detect it at early stages.

Mr. Speaker, on National Cancer Survivors Day, we are grateful for those who have won their fight against cancer, and now we commit to honoring more survivors through research for new and improved cures.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, our current immigration policies are hurting families, tearing them apart, and deporting people who are part of the very fabric of our communities.

I have a few people in particular I plan to talk about and whose stories I will be sharing, but first I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE), my colleague and friend.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii for yielding to me and for her leadership on this issue. I served with her for 2 years on the Homeland Security Committee of the House of Representatives and saw her ability to balance the national interests and capitalizing and maximizing the opportunity that immigrants provide and have always provided to the United States while ensuring that we protect the homeland and our sacred commitment to every person and family that we represent to make sure that they are safe.

I think that the community that I have the honor of representing in Congress, El Paso, Texas, is a case in point. We are one of the safest cities in the United States today.

If you use the FBI's crime statistics as crunched by CQ Press, they routinely rank El Paso, Texas, the safest city in not just the State of Texas, but in the United States. For the last 20 years, we have been the safest, second safest, or third safest in the country. That is not in spite of the fact that we are connected with Mexico—our sister city is Ciudad Juarez—and it is not in spite of the fact that 24 percent of the people that I represent were born in another country, most of them in Mexico.

In fact, our security, our success, our strength is connected to the fact that we are a city of immigrants, that we are connected to the rest of the world through our shared border with Mexico, and that understanding that is critical to preserving the security and public safety which is such a critical part of our job. I will give you an example.

Not too long ago, under this administration, a woman who was an undocumented immigrant from Mexico was in an El Paso County courtroom seeking a protective order because her boyfriend threatened her life. The judge in that courtroom granted that protective order, and as that woman was leaving the courtroom, she was apprehended by a plainclothes Border Patrol agent. That has never, to my knowledge, happened in our community in the El Paso County Courthouse.

The consequences of that are not just that this one person was taken off the streets and placed into detention and custody. The consequence is that we have fewer people from the immigrant community in El Paso coming forward to serve as witnesses to crimes, to report crimes in the first place, to testify, to take part in the criminal justice system in a way that has kept our community safe.

By definition, today, because of that one act, because of the climate of fear and intimidation and anxiety produced by this administration, El Paso, Texas, the State of Texas, this country is less safe.

If we want to respond to the most urgent issue that each constituent of ours depends on us for, that is their safety, their security, that of the community and the country that we serve, then we need to make sure that we treat everyone within our communities that we represent with dignity and respect. We need to make sure that local law enforcement is not seen as a tool of Federal immigration law, but that they are there to preserve and to protect the peace and to serve the constituents and the people who live in those communities.

I would also add that next week marks the fifth anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program implemented under President Obama. It was an important step that this country took to realize the gains that we and future generations will receive by ensuring that those young people who arrived on our shores and through our land ports of entry like El Paso, through no fault of their own, at the tender age of 5 or 6 years old and who are now in school or want to serve in our military or want to create jobs themselves are able to stay here and flourish so that we receive the benefit of their potential.

I hope this Congress, every colleague from both sides of the aisle, will work with me and others to ensure that we have, if not comprehensive immigration reform, which I think should remain the goal, reform in those areas like for the DREAMers and the DACA beneficiaries that is most urgent and to the States that we represent and serve, like Texas, with 200,000 DACA beneficiaries out of 700,000 nationwide. It is the right thing to do for our security. It is the right thing to do for economic growth and job creation. It is the right thing to do in the best interests and traditions of this country.

So I conclude by again thanking the gentlewoman from Hawaii for leading this discussion on this critically important issue, and I thank her for the privilege of being able to speak tonight.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his leadership and his commitment to not only the families and the people in his district, but to the challenges that many families are facing all across the country, and I look forward to continuing to work with him on these issues.

Some of these challenges that face families across the country touch my constituents in Hawaii as well. I would like to share a few of their stories and their challenges here today in the hopes that Congress and this administration take action and do the right thing for them and for our country.

We are a nation of immigrants. Andres Magana Ortiz's story is not a new one. It is not one that will surprise anyone.

□ 1730

In fact, it will be quite recognizable to most of us. No tradition is as American as telling the stories of our relatives and ancestors who, against all odds and great difficulties, found and made a home here on our shores.

But while our family histories remind us of how far we have come, Andres' story demonstrates the progress that we have yet to make and who is hurt and affected by the lack of that progress today.

Andres Ortiz came to Hawaii seeking the American Dream. With hard work, perseverance, and a little luck, Andres demonstrated what we, as Americans, know to be true and that we strive for: if you work hard, you can succeed and get ahead.

Andres started a new life in 1996 picking coffee—backbreaking, tough work, for anyone who has done it before—in the Kona region on the island of Hawaii. He proved himself smart and capable, and he was soon promoted to supervisor. By 2010, he saved enough to buy his own coffee farm. Today, he owns 20 acres of coffee trees, and manages another 150 acres for his neighbors.

Andres quickly earned a reputation as a knowledgeable and skillful farmer. When an invasive beetle, called the coffee berry borer, began to ravish our Kona coffee farms and trees, Andres began a pioneering system to help his community track and eradicate this infestation, even before our U.S. Department of Agriculture took action. Now, this infestation was not just a small matter. It was something that cost our farmers millions of dollars.

Our country offered Andres the means to become an entrepreneur, and he paid us back in full: he started a business, he creates jobs, he takes care of his workers, and he is a leader in our community. Andres is not a legal resident of Hawaii, but Hawaii owes him a debt for his contributions.

Managing the coffee farm is a family affair for Andres. He is a proud husband and father of three children. His wife and kids are all American citizens, and his kids only know Hawaii as home.

Andres embodies the spirit of the American Dream, and serves as an example of why we should welcome courageous, hardworking immigrants into our community. The reality that Andres faces now, sadly, is far different.

If Andres is deported to Mexico, as is supposed to happen in just a few days, his family, their farm, and Kona coffee growers are going to face an uncertain future. Without Andres to run the business, his family could lose their farm and lose their home. Their neighbors will lose a friend and a business partner. Brenda, his wife, will be without her husband, and their three children will be without their father.

If Andres is forced to leave, the law will keep him from his family for 10 years. Should the family move to Mexico with Andres, they will have to learn a new language and a new culture. His daughter will have to drop out of college at the University of Hawaii and begin a new life in another country. Relocating to Mexico would deprive them of the benefits afforded to the citizens of this country.

Now, unfortunately, Andres's story is not a singular one. Unfortunately, there are more.

Just last week, Graham Ellis of Waimea, a 67-year-old British national and leukemia patient, heard a knock on his door. It was two Department of Homeland Security agents who have come to begin the deportation process back to the U.K. after Graham had made Hawaii his home for over 36 years. After a few short minutes of conversation in front of his wife, Dena, who is an American citizen, Graham agreed to turn himself in at a field office in Honolulu the following day.

Now, like Mr. Ortiz, Graham is a pillar within our community in Hawaii. But unlike Mr. Ortiz, Graham had already made the decision to return to the U.K. because he feared that deportation was inevitable under the heightened threats faced under our current immigration policies. Graham had made the decision to leave by the end of summer, thinking that these remaining months would give him time to get his affairs in order, and say good-bye to the community and the home that he grew to love for so long.

A circus performer by training, Graham spent much of his life in Hawaii teaching children from low-income and at-risk communities circus arts, bringing smiles and laughter to their faces and their lives.

He served on the Puna Community Council, and was the founding president of the Kalapana Seaview Estates Community Association.

In his remaining final months, he had planned to make a trip to Kauai, where he would instruct his last group of young, passionate students at a 2-week

superhero-themed circus camp before shutting it down for good.

Our immigration system is broken. We need a pathway to citizenship for immigrants to ensure people who deserve to be here can find a way to be a part of our great country. We need real immigration reform that keeps families together and integrates hardworking, tax-paying immigrants into our community. We need to preserve, protect, and restore the values that underlie the greatness of our country.

I stand with Andres and Graham and the millions of hardworking immigrants who built our great Nation; and I stand with these immigrants who live in my community, who live in my district, and who have a proven record of upstanding contributions to our community.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), my colleague.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the beautiful State of Hawaii for yielding to me, and I thank her also for being a champion of immigrants, both in her State and across the Nation.

It is Immigrant Heritage Month this month, and I think it is critical that we take a few moments to talk about the state of immigration here in the United States. I can't do that any better than by talking about a few stories of what I have experienced over the past few months.

On January 27 of this year, we saw President Trump sign his executive order, quite expeditiously, on a travel ban that specifically targeted the Muslim community, with seven countries, where 90-plus percent of the population practice Islam.

It was an interesting moment for me. My wife and I were having dinner with a few friends of ours in the district, and one of them had asked me: Well, how is this ban going to affect you? How is it going to affect your district?

At the moment, I wasn't really sure, but then I got a call only a few minutes later by my district director. Our first constituent was identified as coming back on a United Arab Emirates flight back from Iraq and was scheduled to land the next morning: a girl who had graduated from the University of Central Florida and lived a very productive life as a legal resident in central Florida for the last 6 years after her graduation.

So we went the next day—early the next morning because, if anything, my legislative experience in the State legislature has told me: go to where the action is, go to where the controversy is, and do what you can to help.

First, we went to Customs and Border Protection, and we got no response. We actually got surprise responses of what were we even doing there, because this was not a matter they were prepared to handle.

So we went to the airport and were greeted by Greater Orlando Aviation Authority officials who were very helpful and understood that these were central Floridians who had been flying for 20 hours and were just about to arrive back into Florida, where they lived.

That morning, I also met a young man who was a citizen from an area just north of the district, who was waiting for his two parents to come in on the same Emirates flight. We found out that the constituent and the two parents were three people who were held back and questioned.

Throughout the day, we would get updates, but what we found out is there was very little information because there was very little understanding by Customs and Border Protection about how to implement this very vague order. The court had just ruled that it was potentially unconstitutional.

So working with our local officials after hours of building up, hours of waiting with the families, hours of press starting to arrive, hours of TV coverage, and hours of protest, right when we were in the middle of doing interviews, that is when the families were finally released, after 7 hours of being questioned without water, without food, after a 20-hour flight.

You could not have scripted this to make the point of how misguided this ban was than what happened. Right in front of TV cameras from across central Florida, first, the two parents came down—parents of a citizen who hadn't seen his parents in over 5 years.

The scene was traumatic: crying, hugs, and welcomed by cameras wondering what had happened to these two individuals. These were simply two citizens of Iraq trying to come over to visit their son, who had already been given visas to come on over.

A few minutes later, our constituent finally arrived as well. She also had been held for 8 hours without water, without food, after a 20-hour flight, and a barrage of questions.

After that, we saw public opinion change sharply in central Florida as people saw these were the alleged people that were getting extreme vetting: people who were visiting their son in central Florida, longtime residents, who only had productive lives in central Florida.

A few weeks later, we had the deportation force memo come down. I was shocked. We sent out letters to our sheriffs, we sent out letters to our schools, asking if they were planning on participating in this deportation force that President Trump had called upon to help implement and enforce our immigration laws.

We called immediately a round table, where we invited immigrant groups, we invited law enforcement groups, and so many others to talk about the issues that were happening.

Two of my three sheriffs immediately said they weren't planning on participating, that this was a Federal issue. A third ended up going from fully participating to, a day later, walking back that position, to just picking up folks who had been accused of violent felonies.

Then our schools responded very quickly after they were posed with a scenario—a situation that was going down the very same day: a citizen, a young woman of Mexican descent, whose parents were also legal immigrants, was asked in front of their classmates about her status.

Afterwards, there were a lot of finger-pointing and excuses that these were questions that were being levied to determine whether she needed to participate in the ESEA program. But at that moment, it was just more of this anti-immigrant rhetoric that was coming out of so many areas in central Florida.

But like that incident, which was covered at length, minds and hearts changed in central Florida. There was an apology given to this young woman who was a citizen, and they changed the policy so that no one would be asked about immigration status in front of their peers, even if it was for something as harmless as the ESEA program.

With our sheriffs clarifying their policies to not join this DHS call for deportation force, we were proud once again to have an inclusive society in central Florida where we welcome everybody. We are such an international community, home to the best theme parks in the world, a world-class convention center and hotels, and we welcome everybody from across the globe.

Then, in addition, I just received a letter from a constituent. Her daughter had grown up, gotten a job, fallen in love, and had a bright future ahead of her. But she worried because her daughter's boyfriend potentially could be deported because he is on an H–1 visa.

These types of policies breaking up families don't serve any interest in helping people pursue the American Dream and don't serve any interest in protecting our economy and protecting growth in central Florida, where we have such a large cattle industry and where we have such a large citrus industry.

Finally, we have so many DREAMers, young students, who live in central Florida, who are working and striving, rising up in our society, and helping people along the way, immigrants who potentially could be one of 40 percent of creators of Fortune 500 companies that have been created here in America, one of the 65,000 servicemen and -women who are immigrants, who serve in our United States military. And we find that, with every 100 immigrants, we are creating 120 new jobs because our country has been founded and created on growth and equality.

□ 1745

So I would like to see a few things happen, things that I believe Democrats and Republicans can agree on. First, let's make sure to ratify the DREAMer program, the Deferred Action program. You have bipartisan cosponsorship for this bill. This is something we could get done, especially for

our veterans and those serving in our U.S. military.

In addition, I believe that we need to relook at the H–1 visa program, the farmworker program. We need to acknowledge the reality that we have had for the last 150 years of agriculture here in the United States, which is that we rely on many of our immigrants coming from Mexico and Central and South America to help with our agriculture. This has been going on for over a century.

What we can do is simply go from a 1-year to maybe a 3-year or 5-year program. I know our immigrants' rights community would support it. I know our agriculture communities would support it; and we wouldn't have people unwittingly not getting back to their country of origin after the 1-year visa expires, when they just want to go back and come back again to help out as seasonal labor.

Then thirdly, there is an arbitrary cap on highly skilled workers here in this country. We train them in Ivy League schools, in brilliant schools in Texas, California, Florida, and across this Nation. And then, because of an arbitrary cap that no one wants to change because of the hot-button issue of immigration, then we send them on their way, back to their countries of origin, rather than keep them here and harness their talent for the future of our economy.

Canada has even got word of this and welcomes these folks. When they realize their visas are up, they beg them to come to Canada to help start new businesses.

So these are some of the ideas that we can fix, that we could all agree on, that both parties can agree on. And of course, in the end, we need a comprehensive immigration reform. But, in the meantime, let's get some things done that we all agree on and move our country forward.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii, one of the most beautiful States of the Union, for her leadership.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Florida for complimenting my State, but for, most importantly, again, putting a face and names to those who are suffering as a result of our broken immigration policy.

You know, for us here, we can stand here and talk about policies and debate them and talk about legislation that needs to be passed. But it is really those folks at home who make it all very real. It is not just a bill number, it is their own family that is being torn apart, it is their own children who are being affected.

Now, you know, I talked about Mr. Ortiz in Hawaii. He and his family are going through this, as we speak, where, in just a few days, he faces being deported. He and his family have exhausted all the options available to them, given the time that they have.

Our delegation from Hawaii, both my colleague, Congresswoman HANABUSA, as well as our Senators, Senator HIRONO and Senator SCHATZ, we have all sent a letter to Secretary Kelly, Department of Homeland Security, urging him to reconsider this order and to halt Mr. Ortiz's deportation, taking a consideration to him and his circumstance and his longstanding commitment and leadership in our community.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 2794, which is what is called a private bill, specifically for the relief of Andres Magana Ortiz. And the purpose of this bill is to help Mr. Ortiz with his extremely challenging situation and to help him on his own path to citizenship.

I urge Chairman GOODLATTE to give positive consideration to this bill that has been referred to his committee. I urge Secretary Kelly, the Department of Homeland Security, to revisit their policy and their decision and to put a halt on Mr. Ortiz's deportation. He is not just a number. He is not just a statistic. He and his family are facing this reality today.

It is always the right time to do the right thing, and I urge these leaders to do that right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to be here. I do greatly appreciate my friend from Hawaii, her views. I know she is a person of integrity; calls them like she sees them. I appreciate her very much.

There are just a number of things that really need to be called out. Here is an article from the Guardian. Julian Borger, June 6, that would be yesterday. The headline is: ''Cancel Donald Trump state visit, says Sadiq Khan, after London attack tweets.''

It states: ''London mayor says U.S. President is wrong about many things and that state visit to Britain should not go ahead.

''The London mayor, Sadiq Khan, has called on the British Government to cancel a planned state visit by Donald Trump after being criticized in two tweets by the U.S. President.''

Now, it really is interesting that the London mayor, after he has his citizens—his people are viciously mutilated, killed in the streets of his city, and, instead of being—going through a self-examination, is there something more I could have done as mayor of this town? Is there something more I could have encouraged? Is there something more we could have done here in England, in Great Britain, in the U.K.? Is there something we could have done that I, in a position of authority, could have done to stop this, to help, at least help stop this?

But Mr. Sadiq Khan apparently didn't go through that, as people were grieving, not just in London but all over the world, here in the United States, praying for the families, grieving with those who were attacked, so many attacked, dozens attacked, instead of perhaps wondering, maybe we don't have our policies quite right, this is yet another attack, and maybe the Britain leaders should have thought, you know, we have been saying that the real key—it has been said around Europe, maybe the real key to stopping radical Islam and the mutilation of innocent people, the slashing of throats, the beheading, the terrible things that have been done by radical Islamists, maybe the way to stop them we were told—not maybe—they said the way to stop them is the Paris climate accord.

If we just show them enough love as they are beheading us, or slashing our throats, and we have signed on, and we are fully part embraced in the Paris climate accord, you know, the radical Islamist murders will stop. That is the kind of baloney we have been told.

And in England, there are people who have indicated as much, how outrageous it was that President Trump pulled the United States out of the Paris accord, because he saw the damage that was going to be done to the United States economy. He saw the damage that would be done to the United States jobs.

I talked to people in east Texas last weekend, different places around east Texas, and they kept coming back: I am so grateful that Donald Trump pulled out of the Paris accord. One of them has a new—some type of concrete business. They have got rights to a specific process that is great for the environment. It is green.

So then we find out our business was going to be devastated if we stayed in the Paris climate accord. It would have gutted our business. We would have been having to file for bankruptcy. Others, you know, the same day, last Saturday, were telling me the same things, different places, same song. We found out how much our business would have been gutted if the President had not pulled out of the Paris accord.

And, of course, we want to be fair to the 160 countries or so that have condemned the United States, said that we are the one partner in the Paris climate accord, just like in Kyoto, and Reykjavik, and all these others, the United States is the most important partner in those accords. Well, yeah, I guess so.

We were going to be the one country that was going to pay billions of dollars to other countries because we have been successful, and we have been innovative, and our Constitution, the brilliance of the Founders to ensure in our Constitution that we were going to reward intellectual property, intellectual thought, would stir intellectual creations. And we loved this idea of private property, you know, before the

last 50 years, we loved this idea of private property, and the Nation has grown.

But as, you know, people have continued to make inroads, taking away private property rights, of course, the economy doesn't grow at the rates that it has in previous days. But at least by pulling out of Paris, we have got a shot to continue to be the most humanitarian, the most charitable Nation, I believe, in the history of the world; that even Solomon's Israel did not have the kind of freedoms and the kind of individual ability to be charitable.

Billions of dollars that have been given. I don't know. Maybe trillions over the years in today's dollars around the world for so many good purposes. And yet if we had stayed in the Paris accord, we would have done so much damage to our own economy.

So I have told many people, thank God, and thank Donald Trump that he got us out of that mess, so that we can continue our climb out of the economic malaise of the Obama years; that we can continue to get back a thriving economy that has been so sluggish for so many years now; not the artificial growth bubble that was created late in the Clinton years, that was bound to burst, not that kind but based on real jobs and manufacturing jobs coming back.

I know from studying history, I think President Trump knows just from his business acumen, that any nation that is considered an international world power, that cannot produce and manufacture the things that are needed in a time of war will not remain a world power past the next war. It won't. So it brings us back to a great thing to get rid of the Paris accord.

Now we have got to cut taxes. And I know there is a lot of screaming from the left about how, gee, wanting to cut taxes for the rich. Well, actually, under President Obama, there was so much damage done to the middle classes. The middle class shrunk in numbers of people, it appears, while the gap between the poor and the rich got even bigger. And as President Obama is on video admitting, it must have been tough, but he admitted, yeah, it is true. It was true.

It is true that, under President Obama, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, first time, 95 percent of the Nation's income went to the top 1 percent. So we have heard all this stuff about Republicans helping the rich and hurting the poor.

There is no President's policy in the history of our Nation that has done more damage to the poor, to the middle class, than the policies of the Obama administration. There is no President's administration that has done more damage to shrink the middle class and to widen the gap between the poor and the rich. And most of those rich who give money seem to just keep giving to the Democratic Party.

□ 1800

You know, I love, whether it is Republicans, Democrats, or Independents coming up with a great idea and making money on it. It is fantastic. You know, as long as it is legal, but it is fantastic.

With all of my faults, jealousy is not one I suffer from. It is great to see anybody work hard or come up with something innovative, and make money. I think it is fantastic. I love the fact that this Nation, for most of our history, has done what we could to incentivize that process.

So the mayor of London condemning President Trump.

Well, who is this guy?

He has got plenty of his own problems. He has got plenty of his own issues. But it wasn't just the mayor of London, Mr. Sadiq Khan. We also heard from the Acting U.S. Ambassador over in London, Lewis Lukens, and he sent out this message: ''I commend the strong leadership of the mayor of London as he leads the city forward after this heinous attack.''

And by virtue of this statement, of course, he is incorporating the decisions by the mayor of London, the decisions by those with whom the mayor of London is consorting, those decisions that have allowed so many radical Islamists to be creating plots and plans to kill Londoners. That has been going on, we find out after this attack. We should have known from the one before, the one before, the one before, that this has been going on.

Lewis Lukens, our highest U.S. ranking official in London, basically condemned President Trump by siding with the mayor of London, who is more concerned about condemning the President of the United States than he is about grieving for his own people, or doing everything within the mayor's conceivable power to stop the next radical attack.

Under the thinking of people like the mayor of London, there should not have ever been an attack in England, not recently, for sure, because they didn't pull out of the Paris accord. And if the Paris accord was going to save the world from radical Islam, then, wow, all of the attacks should be happening in the United States of America.

Unless we get our friends on the other side of the aisle to help us as we need to do to pass legislation that give us the protection we need, the attacks will be coming. But it wouldn't make sense—if you believe people like this, and those that say Paris is the key to ending radical Islam, it wouldn't make sense that London would be hit twice instead of the United States. They didn't pull out. They condemned us for pulling out.

So it makes you think, when you really look at everything, maybe the key to defeating radical Islam is what Americans who have fought them know: there is only one way to defeat radical Islam, and that is to defeat it; to fight it, kill it, defeat it.

I saw President Carter here on television here in the last few days. I had it on mute, so I don't know what he said. A sweet man. Of course, he does seem to have some pretty strong anti-Semitic feelings, so it is hard to feel too much about the sweetness when you see and hear comments that make you know he really doesn't care much for certain Jews or Israel. But I know he meant well when he abandoned the Shah of Iran, not a nice man like Qadhafi—not a great man, not a nice man, but at least he was keeping radical Islam in the box, keeping it boxed up.

When President Carter saw the Shah deposed and the Ayatollah Khomeini comes into Iran, he didn't recognize that he had literally opened Pandora's box, and it was going to be a plague upon the world for years and years to come, and that thousands and thousands of Americans would die trying to put radical Islam back in the box from which President Carter let it escape and from which President Obama encouraged more—not intentionally, but the actions have consequences, and Americans have continued to die and will continue until radical Islam, with the help of our Muslim friends that don't want to be ruled by radical Islamists, with their help—we have got to have their help—we can get it back in the box the way it once was.

But there are people like Lewis Lukens, our highest ranking U.S. official in London, who don't recognize this. But the name to so many sounded familiar, Lewis Lukens. I know I have heard that name before. Oh, well, after tweeting out, or sending out the message from the U.S. Embassy in London, taking sides in favor of the mayor of London over the President of the United States—let's see, who is this—as the article from Monica Showalter says:

''So who is Acting Ambassador Lewis Lukens anyway?

''Turns out he's a career diplomat, with nearly 30 years' experience in assorted outposts. His most prominent positions, however, have been at the side of the person who must have served as a sort of mentor, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, serving as her chief administrative officer. In that time frame, he managed to reach the inner circle of Clinton's tight little circle of acolytes—on the same level as Cheryl Mills and Huma Abedin.

''In testimony to Congress, Lukens claimed to have come up with the idea of having Clinton set up a private server.''

Oh, that is right. He is the genius that came up with the idea of having Hillary Clinton have a private server so it was more easy for our enemies to hack classified information. But then again, we find out, well, it really didn't make that much difference because she was sending it to Huma Abedin, who was sending it to Mr. Weiner.

Anyway, it turns out, all kinds of felonies were being committed, Federal laws being violated. Of course, under Director Comey, he didn't want to pursue anybody like that because he is

sure they meant well, even though they were violating the law right and left.

But Lukens takes the side of the mayor, and he is the same guy that came up with the private server idea for Hillary Clinton. So I know, on behalf of those who supported President Trump, we greatly appreciate the damage that he did to the Democratic Party. Lukens—and, hopefully, he won't be long for being the highest ranking U.S. official in London. Hopefully, we can send somebody over there that doesn't have great ideas like he had for Hillary Clinton that causes our British friends the kind of trouble he caused for Hillary Clinton.

And then we have got this from Will Carr, WGMD News Radio:

''Concerns are being raised on Capitol Hill about whether partisan politics could impact the 2020 Census and swing congressional redistricting in favor of Democrats.

''FOX News has learned that last summer, a pro-Democratic analytics firm that described itself as 'a platform for hope and change'. . . .''

Wow. Yeah, as we saw over the last 8 years, 95 million Americans—the highest number in our history—even gave up looking for work. So they weren't reflected in the unemployment numbers, but they just gave up. It was so hopeless. So much for hope and change.

Anyway, this analytics firm is ''a platform for hope and change,'' but it '' . . . included as a subcontractor in a $415 million advertising contract for the 2020 Census.

''The data firm, Civis Analytics, was founded by the chief analytics officer on former President Barack Obama's 2012 reelection campaign.

''Since congressional redistricting, which occurs every 10 years, is based on the results of the national Census, the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee is now asking the Secretary of the Department of Commerce to ensure that the Census will be conducted in a nonpartisan fashion—and that redistricting will not be impacted.

'' 'In 2016, the Bureau awarded an advertising contract that included a subcontractor with close ties to the partisan politics that reportedly ''spun out of'' the reelection campaign of President Obama,' Senator RON JOHNSON''—our friend from Wisconsin—''wrote to Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross in a letter obtained by FOX News.''

Our friend, Senator RON JOHNSON, says: ''This partisan lineage raises concern in light of a Democratic initiative to use the results of the 2020 Census to draw district lines in a manner favorable to Democratic candidates.''

So, wow, what a deal. The Obama administration has got their own consulting firm helping with the 2020 Census. That ought to concern a lot of people that want to make sure that our little experiment as a democratic republic does not come to an end. As Ben Franklin warned, we could have it as long—if we could keep it, that is.

But the shocking story today that I am not hearing enough talk about, and printed out by Circa, John Solomon and Sara Carter today: ''A former U.S. intelligence contractor tells Circa he walked away. . . .''

This is a U.S. intelligence contractor.

Where have we heard that term?

That is what we were told that Edward Snowden was.

Well, this says: ''. . . he walked away with more than 600 million classified documents on 47 hard drives from the National Security Agency and the CIA, a haul potentially larger than Edward Snowden's now infamous breach.''

But it sounded like a good thing.

It says: ''And now he is suing former FBI Director James Comey and other government figures, alleging the Bureau has covered up evidence that he provided them showing widespread spying on Americans that violated civil liberties.

''The suit, filed late Monday night by Dennis Montgomery, was assigned to the same Federal judge who has already ruled that some of the NSA's collection of data on Americans violates the U.S. Constitution's Fourth Amendment, setting up an intriguing legal proceeding in the Nation's Capital this summer.

''Montgomery says the evidence he gave to the FBI chronicle the warrantless collection''—not just phone metadata—''of phone, financial and personal data and the unmasking of identities in spy data about millions of Americans.

'' 'This domestic surveillance was all being done on computers supplied by the FBI,' Montgomery told Circa in an interview. 'So these supercomputers, which are FBI computers, the CIA is using them to do domestic surveillance.' ''

□ 1815

Gee, we have been assured that does not happen. We have been assured in hearings in our Judiciary Committee over the last 12 years I have been here—and we have had a lot of hearings on these issues. We have been assured this isn't happening. This guy who knows enough to steal 600 million classified documents on 47 hard drives without getting caught says it is happening.

Mr. Speaker, let me parenthetically insert here, we have had a number of conversations with FBI and different intelligence officials, because section 702 that allows this kind of widespread collection, if we are going after what we were told would be foreign terrorists, known foreign terrorists, and they happened to capture an American, the name is masked. You can't get that information. There has to be probable cause to get anything about the American. We are finding out names have been unmasked.

Now, this information by Montgomery is that things are leaked about Americans. Widespread information is being collected on Americans with no probable cause they committed any crime.

I have told numerous DOJ and intelligence officials—and I am very serious about this—they must show that they can police their own ranks of people who are violating Americans' civil rights and gathering information in ways Orwell could never have dreamed of. As my friend THOMAS MASSIE was pointing out today, Orwell thought it would take people to spy on other people. He never dreamed that we, the government, would be able to collect warehouses full of information on little disks that would be used and pulled out later any time they wanted to go after an individual—but it sure looks like it is happening.

If our own justice and intelligence officials cannot police themselves and produce the very people who have leaked information and who have unmasked information, I will join with many of my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle to vote against them ever having those types of powers again. They are going to have to police themselves. They are going to have to produce the people who have been leaking, who have been unmasking, and who have been spying on Americans without legal authority. They are going to have to produce those people, because if they can't and if they don't, they have no business having this kind of power. I know it has got a lot of our justice officials and intelligence officials upset.

Based on the way things have been going and from what we keep finding out, I am sure somebody has been going through my background with a fine-tooth comb looking for anything so they can take me out, but good luck.

I am sure, as Heritage Foundation has written before, probably most Americans are committing a number of Federal crimes a day we don't even know about. So, apparently, it can be done if Heritage is right, as I think they are. But the fact is it ought to scare every American that there is this much Federal intervention in their own personal lives.

The truth is we have got to get rid of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. They have no right and they have no authority under our Constitution to gather people's financial information unless there is probable cause to believe a crime has been committed and that this person has committed the crime, and then get a warrant to get it. It is time to end that for real. It is time to end this kind of personal snooping on American citizens.

This article goes on and says: ''Documents obtained by Circa outside of the lawsuit show that the U.S. Attorney's Office in Washington in 2015 approved a grant of limited immunity for Montgomery so he could explain how he managed to walk out of his contract and the buildings he worked in with

the classified material'' on 47 hard drives.

''He said he returned the hard drives to the FBI, a fact confirmed in government documents reviewed by Circa.

'' 'They're doing this domestic surveillance on Americans, running a project on U.S. soil,' Montgomery alleged. He did not disclose the classified name of the project but said he revealed all aspects of the project during his interview with the FBI.

'' 'Can you imagine what someone can do with the information they were collecting on Americans, can you imagine that kind of power.'

''Officials with the FBI and CIA declined to comment due to current and pending litigation.

''The FBI contacts with Montgomery were encouraged by a senior status Federal judge who encouraged the two sides to meet rather than allow for any of the classified materials to leak, according to interviews Circa conducted.

''Montgomery's lawsuit, which included his lawyer, the well-known conservative activist Larry Klayman, alleges Montgomery provided extensive evidence to the FBI of illegal spying on Americans ranging from judges to businessmen like the future President Donald Trump.

''The suit did not offer specifics on any illegal spying, but it accused the Bureau of failing to take proper actions to rectify Montgomery's concerns.

''Montgomery divulged to the FBI a 'pattern and practice of conducting illegal, unconstitutional surveillance against millions of Americans, including prominent Americans such as the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court' ''—wow—'' 'other Justices, 156 judges, prominent businessmen, and others such as Donald J. Trump, as well as plaintiffs themselves.' ''

That is the allegation in the suit.

'' 'Plaintiffs were assured that the FBI, under Defendant Comey, would conduct a full investigation into the grave instances of illegal and unconstitutional activity set forth by Montgomery. However, the FBI, on Defendant Comey's orders, buried the FBI's investigation because the FBI itself is involved in an ongoing conspiracy to not only conduct the aforementioned illegal, unconstitutional surveillance, but to cover it up as well,' the suit added.

''Klayman and Montgomery also alleged that they have evidence that they themselves have been improperly spied upon by U.S. intelligence. The suit named numerous other defendants as well, including NSA Director Mike Rogers, former CIA Director John Brennan, and even former President Barack Obama.

''Court records indicate the suit was assigned in Washington to U.S. District Judge Richard Leon, who in 2015 issued an historic ruling that the NSA's past bulk collection of Americans' phone records most likely violated the Constitution.''

Thank God he ruled as he did.

''The agency has since ended that practice but the pending case, which is winding its way through appeals and motions, is likely to shine a light on whether Americans' civil liberties were violated during more than a decade of the war on terror.''

This is incredible.

Then, when we hope the courts may be our help, we see another answer that is incredibly discouraging, Federal courts stepping in where they have no authority. Federal court, district court, court of appeals, they have no authority to grant standing to people that are not in the United States, standing and rights to people that are not American citizens and not on American soil. But that is the effect of what they are doing when they say that the President and, actually, Congress, which gave the President much of the power he has on the issue of travel bans and immigration, that we don't have the authority.

Well, under the Constitution, we do have the authority. Congress has the authority and the President has authority to protect us when it comes to national security. He has authority to make decisions like he has. There is no constitutional right under the United States Constitution for someone in another country to have a right to come into the United States. There is no such constitutional right.

For any harebrained judge in America to say that indicates that this is like artificial intelligence becoming self-aware: Wow, I can do whatever I want.

Once it becomes like AI, once it becomes self-aware, then it begins to protect itself. Anyone who has authority or ability to rein them in: We have got to slap them down and limit their ability to rein us in with our artificial intelligence—which is more than some of the judges have.

Mr. Speaker, I am not singling out an individual so I am not violating the House rules.

But this is serious. This is a blow to our experiment as a little, self-governing republic. It is a threat to our ability to proceed as such.

But every Federal court except for the Supreme Court owes its entire existence and jurisdiction to the United States Congress. Congress brings those courts into being, and we can take them out. Congress gives them their jurisdiction, and we can take them out.

I think it is time to begin to take out some of these courts that, like artificial intelligence, have become self-aware and now are trying to lash out and take power away from those under our Constitution that have it and to take it unto themselves in a self-protection mode.

It is getting dangerous in the United States of America for a number of reasons. Radical Islam is only one of the reasons, but courts are going so far to overrule common sense and overrule the words of the Constitution and overrule the words of lawfully passed bills in the House and the Senate signed by Presidents and approved in other case law.

Courts are coming back now and just deciding: We are like artificial intelligence. We are most important now that we are self-aware as the courts, and we are going to do everything we can to limit congressional authority and executive authority and bring all power and protection unto ourselves in the courts.

It is getting dangerous from a constitutional standpoint. All of this is occurring.

There is an article from Conservative Review by Daniel Horowitz, June 5: ''7th Circuit Codifies Transgenderism into the Constitution.''

The courts did such a great thing in America pointing out the importance of immutable characteristics. Characteristics that are immutable are not changeable, whether it is the color of the skin, a race, or a gender. Things that are immutable need to be protected from discrimination.

Once the courts began to get into protecting characteristics that change on the whim of the carrier of those characteristics, then the courts started getting us into an area that also is a threat to a constitutional republic with private property rights, with privacy rights, and with the freedoms that we used to have and that are being infringed.

When the courts come back and say that you have to protect non-immutable characteristics that may change day to day wholly in the mind of the proponent, where does it stop?

□ 1830

It is a destructive force. We all agreed on race, everybody I know. I am sure there are some racists in America. In fact, I know there are still some. We have got some people who, I can't believe, after the lessons that should have been learned from the Holocaust, hate Jews, hate Israel, want it destroyed, removed. Incredible.

The courts are saying we have to preserve some right that none of the rest of us can know, some characteristic none of the rest of us can know. It could change moment by moment. One moment someone is saying: I feel like a girl; I am going in the girl's restroom; or I feel like a boy today.

Who can know? If it is not apparent, then how can somebody be said to be bigoted against or take some action against when you couldn't even know what was in their head? How did I know?

I didn't discriminate against somebody for something I didn't know they had. It was all in their mind. How can I know? When the courts get us into that kind of quagmire, we can't recover. It will sink our ship.

In this case, as Daniel Horowitz says:

''Last week, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals became the latest Federal appeals court to codify

transgenderism into law and the Constitution.

''Although Obama's executive mandates for transgender bathrooms have gone by the wayside, thanks to Attorney General Jeff Sessions overruling the liberal whims of Education Secretary Betsy DeVos, the courts are engaging in their own social transformation on behalf of the defeated Democrats.

''In Whitaker v. Kenosha Unified School District, a unanimous opinion from the three-judge panel ordered a Wisconsin school district to allow a girl to use the boys' bathroom in school. Following in the footsteps of the Sixth and Fourth Circuits, this Seventh Circuit panel, which included GOP-appointee Ilana Rovner, ruled that the 1972 title IX education law and the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause cover transgenderism as a protected class.

''As the courts redefine our national sovereignty, rewrite election laws and redistricting in favor of Democrats, redefine criminal justice law for mass murderers, and mandate publicly funded abortions, they are using their self-acclaimed status as kings to redefine sexuality retroactive to laws and amendments codified long before the sexual-identity movement was in vogue.

''In an emotional screed disguised as law, this opinion uses male pronouns to describe a woman with female parts. In any other era, these judges would have been deemed mentally unstable to serve on a bench.

''While refusing to recognize biological sex as immutable—or, even significant—the court contended that there is absolutely no disruption or privacy concerns over opposite sexes using the wrong bathrooms:

''A transgender student's presence in the restroom provides no more of a risk to other students' privacy rights than the presence of an overly curious student of the same biological sex who decides to sneak glances at his or her classmates performing their bodily functions.

''The court then appealed to common sense to disregard any remaining privacy concerns as 'conjecture and abstraction.'

''Why is it I have a sneaking suspicion that when title IX was drafted in 1972, much less when the 14th Amendment was drafted in 1867, they completely understood the privacy concerns but would have never fathomed judges maniacally referring to a Y chromosome as an X chromosome?

''Amazingly, the legal liberals are the ones with the hypocritical arguments, even according to their own twisted logic. How could this school district be guilty of violating equal protection and engaging in stereotyping for actually applying science equally, and not going along with the deliberate stereotyping requested by the plaintiff?

''There is no greater stereotype than saying that a girl, despite being a girl, should be treated like a boy because she acts out in a 'manly' way. The entire sexual-identity movement is built upon the very sex stereotypes they want to codify into law but also protect from discrimination.

''This is part of a broader hypocrisy in which the transgender lobby is filing lawsuits to apply disability laws to gender-confused individuals, but, on the other hand, are suing on discrimination grounds for stereotyping and recognizing this 'disability' as a disability and not as a natural phenomenon.

''Either way, the courts will always reach the legal conclusion that best promotes the socially licentious political outcome . . . even when the 'jurisprudence' is contradictory.

''Last year, the Fourth and Sixth Circuits said that transgenderism being codified into civil rights and the Constitution is 'settled law,' demonstrating how irremediably broken the courts are. This is not just the Ninth Circuit; we have yet to find a single circuit willing to understand the most immutable laws of nature. Thus, it is not surprising that almost every court is creating a right for Somalis to immigrate. If marriage and human sexuality are subjective, so are the borders of a nation.

''Although the Supreme Court punted the Fourth Circuit case, Grimm v. Gloucester County, because that one was built upon Obama's obsolete transgender mandate, it is quite clear that another case will end up before the high court within the next year.

''Given Justice Anthony Kennedy's history on this issue—and his penchant for being influenced by growing momentum in the lower courts and the legal profession—it's fairly safe to say we will be confronted with the transgender version of Obergefell in the near future.

''The transgender case comes just 2 months after the Seventh Circuit codified sexual orientation into Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.''

That is a court passing legislation illegally, unconstitutionally, just by fiat by the court. Their signature, just like any good oligarch.

''This circuit, like many others, is drifting more and more to the far left. A number of the GOP appointees, such as Richard Posner and Ilana Rovner, are among the worst offenders.

''There are only two reliable originalists on the court, Michael Kanne and Diane Sykes. That is why it is so important for Trump to immediately fill the two vacancies on the court with known originalists. Even more importantly, this is yet one more reason to make the courts less consequential by reforming their jurisdiction and scope of power.''

And I would add, taking them out. If they are that irresponsible, let's take them out.

What they refuse to look at is real science—real medical science. That is exactly what Dr. Paul McHugh did. He published this article in The Wall Street Journal on May 13, 2016. It was updated, apparently, from June 12, 2014.

This was the head of psychiatry, Dr. Paul McHugh, at Johns Hopkins Hospital, the first hospital in America to have actually carried out sex-change operations in America.

These were liberal, far-thinking, far-reaching ideas within surgery at Johns Hopkins. Well, yes, we can cut off organs, change their sexuality. Dr. Paul McHugh was head of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Dr. McHugh is a man who knows the medical science, not some idea that fleets by that may be gone tomorrow about someone's sexuality.

Dr. McHugh says:

''The transgendered suffer a disorder of 'assumption' like those in other disorders familiar to psychiatrists. With the transgendered, the disordered assumption is that the individual differs from what seems given in nature—namely one's maleness or femaleness. Other kinds of disordered assumptions are held by those who suffer from anorexia and bulimia nervosa, where the assumption that departs from physical reality is the belief by the dangerously thin that they are overweight.''

He goes on and says:

''With body dysmorphic disorder, an often socially crippling condition, the individual is consumed by the assumption 'I'm ugly.' These disorders occur in subjects who have come to believe that some of their psycho-social conflicts or problems will be resolved if they can change the way that they appear to others. Such ideas work like ruling passions in their subjects' mind and tend to be accompanied by a solipsistic argument.

''For the transgendered, this argument holds that one's feeling of 'gender' is a conscious, subjective sense that, being in one's mind, cannot be questioned by others. The individual often seeks not just society's tolerance of this 'personal truth' but affirmation of it. Here rests the support for 'transgender equality,' the demands for government payment for medical and surgical treatments, and for access to all sex-based public roles and privileges.''

He goes on and says:

''We at Johns Hopkins University—which in the 1960s was the first American medical center to venture into 'sex-reassignment surgery'—launched a study in the 1970s comparing the outcomes of transgendered people who had the surgery with the outcomes of those who did not. Most of the surgically treated patients described themselves as 'satisfied' by the results, but their subsequent psycho-social adjustments were no better than those who didn't have the surgery. And so at Hopkins we

stopped doing sex-reassignment surgery, since producing a 'satisfied' but still troubled patient seemed an inadequate reason for surgically amputating normal organs.

''It now appears that our long-ago decision was a wise one. A 2011 study at the Karolinska Institute in Sweden produced the most illuminating results yet regarding the transgendered, evidence that should give advocates pause,'' including the courts that think that they can see a fleeting thought in a litigant's mind and say, Oh, there is a fleeting thought, that is an immutable characteristic. Therefore, we are going to give it rights, even though we can't see it, we don't know what it is. We have just got some idea, so we will call it an immutable characteristic.

But according to the Karolinska Institute study—which is a long-term study, and, for 30 years, they followed 324 people who had sex-reassignment surgery.

''The study revealed that beginning about 10 years after having the surgery, the transgendered began to experience increasing mental difficulties. Most shockingly, their suicide mortality rose almost twentyfold above the comparable nontransgender population. This disturbing result has as yet no explanation but probably reflects the growing sense of isolation reported by the aging transgendered after surgery. The high suicide rate certainly challenges the surgery prescription.''

Some of these Federal judges don't realize they are contributing to problems of indescribable proportions that may not be known, as the study indicated, for 10 years or so.

As Dr. McHugh points out:

''Another subgroup consists of young men and women susceptible to suggestion from 'everything is normal' sex education, amplified by internet chat groups. These are the transgender subjects most like anorexia nervosa patients: They become persuaded that seeking a drastic physical change will banish their psycho-social problems. 'Diversity' counselors in their schools, rather like cult leaders, may encourage these young people to distance themselves from their families and offer advice on rebutting arguments against having transgender surgery. Treatments here must begin with removing the young person from the suggestive environment and offering a countermessage in family therapy.''

□ 1845

''Then there is this subgroup of very young, often prepubescent children who notice distinct sex roles in the culture and, exploring how they fit in, begin imitating the opposite sex. Misguided doctors at medical centers including Boston's Children's Hospital have begun trying to treat this behavior by administering puberty-delaying hormones to render later sex-change surgeries less onerous—even though the drugs stunt the children's growth and risk causing sterility. Given that close to 80 percent of such children would abandon their confusion and grow naturally into adult life if untreated, these medical interventions come close to child abuse.''

And that is basically what these Federal courts are contributing to. As Dr. McHugh says, they come close to child abuse themselves. He didn't say that about the courts; that is my insertion. But as Dr. McHugh, after being open to helping the transgendered every way that was available, he bases his decision on science, on medical science, on study, not on some whim of someone with a fleeting idea in their mind, maybe it lasts for decades, maybe it doesn't.

But Dr. McHugh says: ''A better way to help these children: with devoted parenting.''

It is not taking them away by the government or some busybody leftwing kooks that think they know better than their own parents. Of course there are parents that aren't fit. I have sentenced some to prison, and I hope some of them never get out of prison. They are a danger. But for heaven's sake, let's allow good parenting.

Dr. McHugh says and finishes: ''At the heart of the problem is confusion over the nature of the transgendered. 'Sex change' is biologically impossible.''

Those are Dr. McHugh's words: ''Sex change is biologically impossible.''

He says: ''People who undergo sex-reassignment surgery do not change from men to women or vice versa. Rather, they become feminized men or masculinized women. Claiming that this is civil rights matter and encouraging surgical intervention is in reality to collaborate with and promote a mental disorder.''

That is what our Federal courts are engaging in. They are promoting a mental disorder, as it has been called in the DSM.

We ought to be about helping these people, not dividing America. But as the studies have indicated, 80 percent of these children that have such ideas, as others have said and he has said, how many of us know girls that were tomboys growing up but ended up being some of the most beautiful and feminine women later. Some may say that is sexist, but there are men who may grow up acting feminized and they grow up to be some of the most handsome, beautiful men you would ever know, but quite masculine.

These courts are not helping. They are playing with the latest fad, and their playing is doing massive destructive damage to our United States Constitution, to our court system, to our freedom, and to what is left of our Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for June 6 and the balance of the week on account of attending his son's graduation.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 2:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of a medical procedure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1515. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Ceiling Fans [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-STD-0045] (RIN: 1904-AD28) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1516. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Dedicated-Purpose Pool Pumps [EERE-2015-BT-STD-0008] (RIN: 1904-AD52) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1517. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps [EERE-2014-BT-STD-0048] (RIN: 1904-AD37) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1518. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Miscellaneous Refrigeration Products [EERE-2011-BT-STD-0043] (RIN: 1904-AC51) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec.

251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1519. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [DE104-1104; FRL-9961-26-Region 3] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1520. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Washington: General Regulations for Air Pollution Sources, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council [EPA-R10-OAR-2016-0785; FRL-9963-12-Region 10] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1521. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Virginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [VA203-5204; FRL-9957-86-Region 3] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1522. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [PA 200-4205; FRL-9959-23-Region 3] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1523. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maryland; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [MD 204-3120; FRL-9959-24-Region 3] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1524. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Redesignation of the Muncie Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0137; FRL-9962-70-Region 5] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1525. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Air Plan Approval and Air Quality Designation; GA; Redesignation of the Atlanta, Georgia 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0583; FRL-9962-27-Region 4] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1526. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's stay of rule — Stay of Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills and Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0215 and EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0451; FRL-9963-19-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT62) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1527. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Alternative Final Cover Request for Phase 2 of the City of Wolf Point, Montana, Landfill [EPA-R08-RCRA-2016-0505; FRL-9962-18-Region 8] received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1528. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Revisions to the New Source Review State Implementation Plan; Air Permit Procedure Revisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2016-0206; FRL-9958-84-Region 6] received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1529. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Revisions to the Administrative Rules of Montana [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0020; FRL-9963-15-Region 8] received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1530. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's confirmation of effective date and compliance date for Major direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Miscellaneous Refrigeration Products (EERE-2011-BT-STD-0043] (RIN: 1904-AC51) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1531. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a series of reports for the second quarter FY 2017, January 1, 2017 — March 31, 2017, developed in accordance with Secs. 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, the March 24, 1979, Report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs (H. Rept. 96-70), and the July 31, 1981, Seventh Report by the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. 97-214); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1532. A letter from the Deputy Inspector General for Audit Services, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a final report, entitled ''U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Met Many Requirements of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 but Did Not Fully Comply for Fiscal Year 2016'', pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3321 note; Public Law 107-300, Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)(ii) (as amended by Public Law 112-248, Sec. 3(a)(2)); (126 Stat. 2391); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1533. A letter from the Labor Member and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1534. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, as amended, and the statistical accomplishments for the period, including information required under the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1997; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1535. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Commission's Semiannual Report to Congress for the Period: October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1536. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Pot Catcher/Processors in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 150916863-6211-02] (RIN: 0648-XF189) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1537. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; General Category Fishery [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XF284) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1538. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2017 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting [Docket No.: 161128999-7428-02] (RIN: 0648-BG47) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1539. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Yellowtail Snapper Management Measures [Docket No.: 160510416-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-BG06) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1540. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Groundfish Fishery; Amendment 18 [Docket No.: 150630567-7360-02] (RIN: 0648-BF26) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1541. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries;

Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions for Tropical Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 170223197-7311-01] (RIN: 0648-BG67) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1542. A letter from the Counsel for Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — July 2017 Revision of Patent Cooperation Treaty Procedures [Docket No.: PTO-P-2017-0002] (RIN: 0651-AD14) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1543. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — MU-2B Series Airplane Training Requirements Update; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2006-24981; Amdt. Nos. 61-138A, 91-344A, and 135-134A] (RIN: 2120-AK63) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1544. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9569; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-052-AD; Amendment 39-18865; AD 2017-09-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1545. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Administration's principles for reforming the Nation's Air Traffic Control System (H. Doc. No. 115—45); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

1546. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2017 Global Defense Posture Report; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2353. A bill to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; with an amendment (Rept. 115–164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2795. A bill to increase coordination among relevant Federal departments and agencies to address United States security and humanitarian interests in Yemen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 2796. A bill to repeal executive overreach, to clarify that the proper constitutional authority for social transformation belongs to the legislative branch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2797. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care coordination services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2798. A bill to prohibit access by the Government of the Russian Federation to certain Russian-owned diplomatic facilities and properties located in the States of Maryland and New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2799. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize certain recycled water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2800. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure improvement of air traffic control services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, the Budget, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2801. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring all new passenger motor vehicles to be equipped with a child safety alert system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H.R. 2802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax-preferred savings account for first-time homebuyers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 2803. A bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2804. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to implement changes to improve air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 2805. A bill to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TROTT, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 2806. A bill to increase authorized funding for the Soo Locks; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 2807. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require congressional notification concerning sensitive military cyber operations and cyber weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 2808. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount that can be withdrawn without penalty from individual retirement plans as first-time homebuyer distributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 2809. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for the authorization and supervision of nongovernmental space activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington) (both by request):

H.R. 2810. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 2811. A bill to preserve the integrity of American elections by providing the Attorney General with the investigative tools to identify and prosecute foreign agents who seek to circumvent Federal registration requirements and unlawfully influence the political process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 2812. A bill to direct the President to develop a strategy for the offensive use of cyber capabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2813. A bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from providing financial support for certain high carbon intensity energy projects; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Ms. LEE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2814. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on employers whose employees receive certain Federal benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 2815. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the ''Sergeant John Basilone Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2816. A bill to authorize a settlement in accordance with the agreement entered into by the Tennessee Valley Authority and the United States Department of the Interior, and counties within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2817. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify eligibility for the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 2818. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for amounts contributed to disaster savings accounts to help defray the cost of preparing their homes to withstand a disaster and to repair or replace property damaged or destroyed in a disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 2819. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require the disclosure of political intelligence activities, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for restrictions on former officers, employees, and elected officials of the executive and legislative branches regarding political intelligence contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 2820. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to establish within the Department of State the Office of Anti-Corruption relating to Illicit Russian Financial Activities in Europe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the credit for increasing research activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana):

H.R. 2822. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to lend Department of Defense farm equipment to eligible farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 377. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should confirm that money is not free speech and that corporations are not people for purposes of the First Amendment right to make campaign contributions by enacting a constitutional amendment overturning the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, and should restore the right of Congress and the States to impose limits on the amount of expenditures that may be made by candidates and others in support of elections for public office by enacting a constitutional amendment overturning the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Buckley v. Valeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 2795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws ''which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution'' any of Congress' enumerated powers.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill modifies the Social Security Act, which Congress enacted pursuant to its powers under the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution, we well as its powers to tax and spend for the general welfare. Congress has the power under those provisions to enact this legislation as well.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To Make Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excise, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, United States Constitution.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 2805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 2806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers vested by this Constitution in the United States, or in any Department or officer therof.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress ''to provide for the common Defence'', ''to raise and support Armies'', ''to provide and maintain a Navy'' and ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces'' as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress ''to provide for the common Defence'', ''to raise and support Armies'', ''to provide and maintain a Navy'' and ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces'' as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 2812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Impost and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 2814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Amendment XVI to the Constitution'': The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 2815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 2818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 2820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof''

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 2821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 2822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 29: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 38: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 40: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 44: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 80: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 93: Ms. MOORE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 154: Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 169: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 173: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 184: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 227: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 299: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 314: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 358: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 367: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 377: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 391: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 392: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 397: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 420: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 422: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 468: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 478: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 490: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 507: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 529: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 545: Mr. COOK, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 592: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. COOK, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 632: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 662: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 681: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 721: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 740: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 747: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 750: Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 754: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 761: Mr. SENSENBRENNER,

H.R. 795: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WOMACK, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 796: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 799: Mr. ALLEN,

H.R. 807: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 820: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 825: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 846: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 848: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 873: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 880: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 881: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 916: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 930: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COOK, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 947: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 952: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 959: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 964: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 997: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1017: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1034: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1046: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1057: Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1064: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1090: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1098: Ms. FUDGE and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1099: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1111: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1116: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1120: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1136: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1146: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1154: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1158: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1164: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1205: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COMER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 1212: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1231: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1244: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1251: Mrs. TORRES and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1316: Mr. VELA, Mr. HARPER, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1339: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1349: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1361: Mr. DONOVAN and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1421: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1422: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1441: Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1456: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1478: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1480: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1503: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1511: Mr. WALZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1529: Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 1540: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1552: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1554: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1555: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1618: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1626: Mr. LAHOOD and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 1651: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1652: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1655: Mr. REED.
H.R. 1661: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1698: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. ROBY and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1734: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1810: Mr YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1811: Mr BIGGS.
H.R. 1817: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1825: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1828: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1840: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1844: Ms. MENG and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1853: Mrs WATSON COLEMAN, Ms Norton, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1863: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1872: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1895: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1952: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1955: Mr. COMER.
H.R. 1970: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1997: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2000: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2001: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2004: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana,
H.R. 2012: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2024: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2045: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2056: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2061: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2069: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2079: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2091: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2106: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2127: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2197: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2200: Mr. CARBAJAL and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2240: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 2248: Mr. BEYER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2287: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 2318: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2319: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2322: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2327: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2353: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 2358: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2394: Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2401: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2434: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2452: Mr. HIMES, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2472: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2478: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 2482: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COLE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2488: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2492: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2499: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2519: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2526: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2564: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2595: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2603: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2620: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. COOK, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2625: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2632: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2634: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2641: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2645: Mr. CORREA and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 2651: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2654: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2657: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.
H.R. 2675: Mr. COLE and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2676: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2687: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2690: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2715: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2716: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2723: Mr. STEWART, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 2747: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2771: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2785: Mr. REED.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H.J. Res. 24: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H.J. Res. 31: Mr. KIND.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.J. Res. 103: Mr. LATTA.
H. Con. Res. 8: Ms. ROSEN.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. HUIZENGA.
H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. EVANS and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 15: Mr. MCEACHIN and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 28: Mr. DELANEY.
H. Res. 31: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 85: Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 129: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H. Res. 135: Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Res. 188: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H. Res. 219: Mr. PAULSEN.
H. Res. 220: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. ROSEN.
H. Res. 274: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 276: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H. Res. 311: Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SOTO, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BYRNE.
H. Res. 317: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 321: Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 336: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H. Res. 342: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 351: Mr. TAYLOR.
H. Res. 353: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 368: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Res. 371: Ms. LEE, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H. Res. 372: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SOTO.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2560: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 2017 No. 97

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Father of love, whose presence and power is revealed to the hearts that long for Your guidance, we thank You for the gift of this day. May we use this borrowed time for Your glory.

As our lawmakers strive to honor You, may they work with commendable zeal, knowing that life's evening is coming when their labor will be done. Lord, give them the wisdom to keep Your words in their hearts, providing them with a lamp for their feet and a light for their paths.

Continue to be our strength and shield. May we think of You consistently and trust You constantly.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1628

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1628) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators today will have an opportunity to advance important bipartisan Iran sanctions legislation. As we consider this bill, we anticipate that amendments addressing Russia sanctions are likely to be offered. I am encouraged that the chairmen of the Foreign Relations and Banking Committees, Senator CORKER and Senator CRAPO, have already been in discussions with their respective ranking members to work toward a bipartisan agreement. I support that effort, and I will have more to say about the underlying legislation tomorrow.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, on one other matter, later today President Trump will visit Cincinnati to discuss the importance of our Nation's inland waterways. Kentucky is home to over 1,900 miles of navigable inland waterways, which, in addition to adding majestic beauty to my State, are also vital to thousands of jobs in the Commonwealth.

In recent years, over 95 million tons of cargo and agricultural products have been transported across these water trade routes. Our many levees, docks, and dams represent crucial infrastructure that play an important role in our regional and national economy.

I am proud of the work Congress has done in the past to protect our Nation's waterways, like passing the Water Resources Development Act by a bipartisan majority last year in order to support infrastructure, enhance commerce, and maintain American ecosystems.

As President Trump continues to release his plans for our Nation's infrastructure, I look forward to working with the administration and colleagues in the Senate to protect and improve the many roads, bridges, airports, and waterways that serve people and jobs all across our country.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 722 occur at 1:45 p.m. today, and if cloture is invoked, time postcloture count as if invoked at 10:30 a.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first on Iran and Russia: This week we will be considering bipartisan legislation to impose sanctions on Iran for its ballistic missile testing, for its human rights abuses, and for its overt support of terrorism. I support this and look forward to a vote on the measure. It is important we do it.

I also understand that the majority leader will consent to an amendment vote alongside that bill on bipartisan Russia sanctions legislation. There is a broad bipartisan consensus for moving forward on tough sanctions against Russia. Russia defied the sovereignty of the Ukraine with the annexation of Crimea. It has been accused of human rights abuses including propping up the brutal Assad regime in Syria, and of course the intelligence community has confirmed that Russia interfered with our democracy.

I appreciate that the majority leader has committed to having a vote on Russia sanctions, and I thank so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for pushing this issue. It is the right thing to do, and I appreciate them doing it.

I strongly believe that Russia's sanctions legislation needs to do three important things. First, we must codify existing sanctions on Russia; second, we need to give Congress a chance to review any decision by this administration before sanctions are lifted; and, third, we need to impose tough, new sanctions on Russia for its attack on our democracy.

Two pieces of legislation, one posted by the two lead sponsors, Senators MCCAIN and CARDIN, the other by Senators GRAHAM and CARDIN—both bipartisan and both, I believe, with at least 10 cosponsors from each side of the aisle—do these things. What we have suggested to the leader is that we put those two bills together and combine them, tweak them a little bit, and move forward. We await the answer from the majority leader on our proposal.

It is certainly our responsibility and the responsibility of this Congress to vote on the tough Russia sanctions bill as a response to Russia's persistent violations of international norms and agreements.

If we do nothing on Russia or if we have a weak bill, we will not accomplish that goal, and Mr. Putin will continue to do everything he is doing. We know sanctions have bite with Russia. If the Russians see that this Congress, in a bipartisan way, is resolute and strong, it will make a difference, and I hope we move forward.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, there are many subjects in this very quickly changing world in which we live. The next subject is infrastructure.

Today, President Trump will continue his infrastructure week in talking about inland waterways. I would like to repeat that Democrats welcome a discussion about these issues. Democrats have argued in favor of a large infrastructure package to address our crumbling roads and bridges, our levees, our dams, our ports, and our locks for a long time. While we disagreed with President Trump on a great many things during the campaign, I think many of my colleagues thought that when Mr. Trump was elected, we could find some common ground on the topic of infrastructure.

Needless to say, so far, the President's actions on infrastructure have been a disappointment. In 6 months, the President has not given any real details about his infrastructure plan. The most he has done is endorse an off-the-shelf plan to privatize air traffic control. In fact, he actually cut infrastructure spending in his budget by over $200 billion. Now, during what they have termed ''infrastructure week,'' the White House has only proposed to privatize much of our infrastructure.

Today, I expect more of the same—bold promises, few details. What details we do hear will likely be about how large financiers should decide where and how to build American infrastructure. That has never happened before. The approach will not address the very broad infrastructure needs we have. Financiers will not pay to finance infrastructure projects from which they cannot make a buck. It is their right to seek a profit—that is what businesses do and are supposed to do—but there is no such thing as a free lunch. They are going to need to get recompense when they lay out money. That kind of approach will not fix our water sewer systems. It will not expand rural broadband. It will not fix our energy grid. It will do one thing—lead to Trump tolls from one end of America to the other.

After the election, we stood ready to work with the President on a real bill, provided it would not be just tax breaks for private financiers or roll back labor and environmental protections. We even wrote a detailed blueprint on how to spend $1 trillion. That was the President's number. It would create 13 to 15 million jobs. It would rebuild our infrastructure—large parts of it—from one end of America to the other. It would not leave out rural areas that will never benefit from any kind of private financing, as Senators BARRASSO and MORAN have made clear.

We sent it to the White House and never heard a peep. I have talked to the President several times on the phone and said that I want to work with him on infrastructure—no response. Now we have their plan without any consultation from Democrats. Even with talk that they should do this on reconciliation, there has been no Democratic support or votes or input. Just as their doing things by reconciliation is tying the Republican Party in knots on healthcare, it does not bode too well for them on tax reform. It will mess up infrastructure as well.

So I hope the President drops his go-at-it-alone infrastructure push and instead decides to sit down and talk to Democrats about the issue. We agree wholeheartedly on the problem and its magnitude. Let's sit down and start talking about what solutions actually make sense. Let's not have a few financiers who whisper into the President's ear determine our infrastructure policy—because it will be a flop.

TRUMPCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, on another matter: healthcare.

Yesterday, the insurer Anthem pulled out of exchanges in Ohio, citing the administration's decision to hold cost-sharing reduction payments hostage as the reason for its exit. Anthem joins a growing list of health insurers that have chosen to leave the 2018 marketplace or considered raising their rates as a result of the uncertainty the President and Republicans are causing—deliberately, in my judgment—in our healthcare system.

The President and Republicans blame ObamaCare for insurers leaving the marketplace. It is simply not true. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said it is the ''substantial uncertainty about enforcement of the individual mandate and about future payments of the cost-sharing subsidies'' that have led insurers to withdraw from the current marketplace. AHIP, which is hardly a Democratic group—it is the largest trade group of insurers and is completely nonpartisan—said the uncertainty about cost-sharing payments was ''the single most destabilizing factor in the individual market.''

The Affordable Care Act is not falling under its own weight. It is being sabotaged deliberately by President Trump and Republicans who have been whipping up all of this uncertainty to gain political advantage, to say: ''I told you so.'' They are hurting millions of people. That is really wrong.

After downplaying weeks of expectations in moving forward, yesterday our

Republican colleagues said they expect to have a repeal bill passed by June 30. That is 23 days from today. From all reports, the efforts by Republican Senators to craft a different TrumpCare will be based on many of the provisions in the House bill—a bill that would remove the guarantee of coverage for preexisting conditions, raise rates on some older Americans by as much as 800 percent, and decimate Medicaid, which so helps rural folks, folks with a family member in a nursing home, and those suffering from opioid abuse. It would also leave 23 million more Americans without health insurance.

I remind all of my colleagues on the other side that drafting a Senate Republican healthcare bill that is based on a House bill is putting lipstick on a pig. TrumpCare is fundamentally flawed, has been rejected overwhelmingly by the American people of all political stripes, and will devastate our healthcare system in order to finance massive tax breaks for the wealthiest of Americans. There is no amount of window dressing that can fix up a flawed concept.

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that even if the proposal is 10 or 20 percent better than the House bill, it ain't close to being good enough for the American people. Republicans ought to drop the repeal. Choose to work with Democrats to actually improve our healthcare system, not to sabotage it.

BORDER WALL

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Mr. President, a word on the President's latest idea for a border wall with Mexico. After the idea of a border wall was roundly rejected in the last omnibus by Members of both parties and after no Republican from a border State area would support the border wall, the President just cannot seem to let it go. Yesterday, it was reported that he actually pitched the idea of a 40- or 50-foot-tall border wall with solar panels. Never mind that he still has not come up with a plan on how to build the wall, where to build it—on our side or the Rio Grande side—or how to get the land on the border from the private citizens who own it. Never mind that a border wall would be incredibly expensive and ineffective in actually preventing illegal border crossings. Never mind that Mexico still wouldn't be paying for the border wall or its solar panels.

The President is still pushing this medieval proposal—now with an absurd twist. Just like painting stripes on a pony doesn't make a zebra, solar panels on a wall no one wants doesn't make it any more attractive. If the President thinks his new idea will catch on in Congress, well, I have a 50-foot-tall wall made of solar panels I will sell to you.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 722, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I understand that we had originally scheduled for, in about 1 minute, a vote on cloture on the new Iran sanctions bill. I understand that the cloture vote has been delayed until early this afternoon.

This comes on the heels of an announcement of very sad news from Iran. I would certainly be among the first to note that some of the people in Iran, the Revolutionary Guard and some of their leadership, support terrorism. They wish ill for us and for our country.

That same country had elections about 2 weeks ago, and the results of those elections were surprising, even for me, but encouraging. The results of the election found that President Rouhani, one of the leaders of reform and one of the modern elements within that country, was reelected by a resounding majority—close to 60 percent of the vote. Although the Supreme Leader thought it would be a one-on-one race for the Presidency, in spite of that, Rouhani was reelected, and we congratulate him. There were a number of municipal elections across the country, most prominently in Tehran where the hard-line mayor of Tehran has been ousted, and moderate forces seem to have made real, encouraging progress from my perspective and I think the perspective of most Americans.

One of the things the Iranians do, which is troubling to me and I think to others in this country, is continue to test ballistic missiles in what we believe is in violation of the United Nations' decision. Iranians are not violating the agreement that was entered into among five nations, including the United States and Iran, roughly 2 years ago in Iran's nuclear joint agreement. They are not violating that, but they are violating other U.N. sanctions.

So this revised sanctions bill, which was scheduled to be debated today and maybe voted on later this week—at least the start of the debate on whether they are going to proceed to the bill—has been delayed until this afternoon. I urge us to consider delaying further action on this Iran sanctions measure today or this week.

The term ''adding insult to injury'' comes to mind. I try to use the Golden Rule to figure out what I should do and how I should behave as a human being, and I think maybe we ought to consider the Golden Rule in this case as well. Iran is not necessarily our close friend. They are not our close ally. I think the potential is there for having a much better relationship as a young generation of Iranians grows up and eventually assumes the leadership of their country.

It is a country of 80 million people, over half of them under the age of 25. They had a revolution in 1979 and captured our Embassy. They held our people for a year or more until after the 1980 Presidential election. Our relations with Iran have been difficult since that time but more encouraging of late—again, a young country of 80 million people, more than half under the age of 25.

The younger generation there wants to have a good relationship with the rest of the world, a better relationship with the rest of the world, and certainly a better relationship with us. I have talked with a number of American leaders, including senior American leaders, who have been to Iran in recent years and were surprised by the warm welcome they received.

It reminds me very much of the warm welcome I received leading a congressional delegation to Vietnam in August of 1991 to find out what happened to thousands of MIAs. We were expecting to be met by suspicion and hostility, and we were warmly embraced at that time. Six of us—Democratic and Republican Congressmen—were there to present to the leadership of Vietnam on behalf of the George Herbert Walker Bush administration a roadmap to normalize relations if they would do a number of things to enable us to find out what happened to thousands of our MIAs. We presented that proposal. John Kerry and JOHN MCCAIN worked very hard on the Senate side and at the same time in Southeast Asia as well. We ended up with normalized relations within a few years of our visit. One of the members of my delegation, Pete Peterson, became our first U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam.

I mention that today because of the hostility we felt toward Vietnam for

many years during the war and after the war and the suspicion that they were holding thousands of our MIAs as POWs, which turned out not to be true. But our efforts, along with those of Senator MCCAIN, Senator Kerry, and others, ended up providing information about the missing and the closure we hoped for hundreds of families of Americans who had lost their loved ones in Vietnam and never recovered their remains—although some of their remains were recovered and returned to the families.

I mention it today because a year ago in Vietnam, with President Obama and Secretary Kerry, and at a time when the Vietnamese were announcing they were going to buy billions of dollars' worth of our Boeing aircraft—we are their top trading partner, and they were going to be an integral part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership that we negotiated, along with other nations. Sadly, that has gone away. I think one of the biggest mistakes of this Congress and the last was to let the transpacific trade partnership die. But Vietnam was a key member of that.

It is kind of ironic to me that a nation with whom we fought in a war, where the names of 55,000 who died are at the Vietnam Memorial—not even 2 miles from where I am standing right now—yet, since the 1970s we have let bygones be bygones and have a much better relationship with Vietnam. They are still Communist, and they are still a one-party system, but they have high regard toward Americans.

Rather remarkably, we learned last April when we were there that they had two surveys done of the Vietnamese people this last year. One survey found that 85 percent of the people surveyed had favorable opinions of the United States, more than any other nation in the world. In the second survey, we learned that about 95 percent of the Vietnamese people had favorable opinions of the United States, more than any other nation on Earth.

Again, we are their top trading partner these days, and they are buying a lot of the products we manufacture and sell. If that relationship can change, I think there is reason to hope our relationship with Iran can change.

We have our pages here. If it were left to the generation the age of our pages or maybe their parents, it would be a brandnew day in Iran. But change is happening there.

The question is, on the heels of this attack by ISIS, with whom we have bitter differences and a hotly contested armed conflict—for us to somehow, on the heels of two attacks by ISIS in Iran, one on the Parliament and the other apparently on the mausoleum for the former Ayatollah, where a dozen or more people have been killed, 40-something wounded—does it make sense for us to take up the Iran sanctions bill today? I don't think so.

My reading of the Golden Rule, treating other people the way we want to be treated, would suggest this might not be the right day to do this—next week, maybe; today, no. I call on our leadership to hit the pause button. There is not a need to rush on this.

The Iran sanctions bill, which is coming to us today, is a much more thoughtful approach than was originally contemplated by the Foreign Relations Committee. They have done a very nice job of improving what I thought was a badly flawed earlier effort. But this might be a good day to hit the pause button. Instead of rubbing salt into a wound, let's wait a few days and consider what to do. If we were in their shoes, I think we would appreciate that gesture. If we were in their shoes, I think the idea of their taking this kind of action or step against us on a day that we have been attacked by ISIS would not be well received. It would be badly received. So I think we ought to treat them the same way.

I think that is pretty much it. I appreciate the chance to come to the floor and say a few words. I call on leadership to delay this vote on cloture and to delay the vote on the underlying bill until next week. When we do the underlying bill on Iran sanctions, let's couple it with something that includes some of the very thoughtful work going on with respect to Russia, which really is creating mischief in this country—not just with elections but otherwise as well—and maybe do a package that includes both together. That might make a lot more sense, and the timing would be a lot better.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I am strongly supportive of adding sanctions against Russia to the bill that is scheduled to come up this afternoon. As I think we all know, Russia actively worked to influence our 2016 Presidential election and continues to try to destabilize democracies around the world, including our own, and that is unacceptable.

At the same time, I have serious concerns about the sanctions on Iran contained in this bill. As we have heard from former Obama administration officials, including Secretary Kerry and Ambassador Sherman, these measures could undermine the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the very important nuclear agreement signed in 2015 between the United States, our P5+1 partners, and Iran. But above and beyond that, let us be aware and cognizant that earlier today, the people of Iran suffered a horrific terror attack in their capital, Tehran, in which 12 people were killed and many more were injured. The Islamic State has claimed credit for this attack.

At a time when tensions are extremely high in that part of the world, our goal must be to find ways to bring people together to reduce tensions rather than to exacerbate this very painful and dangerous situation. Let us also remember that the leaders of Iran immediately expressed condolences for the September 11 attacks against the United States and that hundreds of Iranians held a candlelight vigil.

It seems to me to be the right thing to do—on a day when Iran has been attacked by ISIS, by terrorism, now is not the time to go forward with legislation calling for sanctions against Iran. I would respectfully request that we delay our vote on this bill until next week. Let us tell the people of Iran that while we have serious disagreements with them on a number of issues, that today, when they are mourning, when they are dealing with the shock of a terrorist attack, today is not the day to go forward with this piece of legislation.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor very briefly to make what, I hope, is a reasonable recommendation to my colleagues on both sides.

We are due to vote later today on moving forward on a piece of legislation that I support. Last week, we voted out of the Foreign Relations Committee a new sanctions bill against the Iranian regime for its continued movement toward a ballistic missile program that, ultimately, could threaten the security of the Middle East and could threaten the security of our sacred ally in the region, Israel. It also speaks to Iran's continued problematic human rights record and its support for terrorism in the region.

We should move forward on this piece of legislation, but I would recommend that we not do so today. There is reason to have this debate, but given the terrorist attack that occurred in Iran, given the fact that today we know that there are 12 dead and 40 wounded in 2 very coordinated attacks, my worry is that, literally, at the moment of grieving in Iran, this resolution would look as directed not at the regime, as it is, but at the Iranian people. It would seem intemperate and, ultimately, do more damage than good.

This is an important resolution to debate. We can find the time to get this done, but given the unfortunate timing—obviously, not intentional in our moving this forward this week—given the attacks that just occurred and for which ISIS has claimed responsibility, I would hope that we could find a way

to move this to another time. I think it is really important because, ultimately, it is in the United States' national security interest for the Iranian people to get their way, who are, broadly speaking, Western-oriented and who, broadly speaking, want a democratic, internationalist future.

In everything we do, we need to make it clear that we have deep disagreements with the Iranian regime—its rhetoric toward Israel, its inflaming of tensions, its funding of proxy wars in the region—and that our beef is not with the people of Iran. From time to time, that is a difficult distinction to make, but it is a very important distinction to make. By choosing to postpone this debate and this vote to another time, I think we will send an important message to the Iranian people that we want to give them the time to grieve and that we want to give them the time to understand the scope of this attack.

I do not think it comes at much of a cost or loss to us. It is important to remember that when we were attacked on September 11, there were vigils held throughout Iran. The regime itself was not sponsoring those, but the Iranian people did stand up and, in substantial numbers, displayed a common cause with the people of this country—again, another sign that this disagreement is not with the people of Iran but with the regime.

Despite my having some reservations about this piece of legislation—I do not endorse it wholeheartedly, but I am a supporter of it and will vote for it when it comes to the floor of the Senate—I would hope that the leadership on both sides of the aisle might find a path so as to give the people of Iran some grieving space, to make sure that we are not sending the wrong message with this vote this afternoon, and to find some time later this summer to take up a very, very important issue.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise today in strong support of the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017, but first I would like to offer my strongest condemnation of the terrorist attack allegedly carried out by ISIS this morning in Tehran, which claimed the lives of 12 people. Attacks on civilians in any corner of the world must be strongly condemned by the United States, and I offer my condolences to the people of Iran and the families who lost loved ones in this latest act of terror.

If anything, these events remind us that the entire Middle East is increasingly under siege, and the United States and the entire international community must unite to confront terrorism and extremism in all of its forms. That means holding governments that continue to foment, fund, and encourage terrorism accountable.

While the people of Iran suffered a heinous attack today, the unfortunate reality is that the violence, volatility, and profound human suffering that imperils the Middle East are all too often linked back to the Government of Iran. Across the region, this regime continues to pursue policies that threaten the national security interests of the United States. It continues to support terrorism and exert influence through the growing power of proxy actors throughout the Levant and Yemen. Even as it continues to supply terrorists across the region with money, weapons, and resources, the people of Iran continue to suffer under an oppressive regime with absolutely no respect for basic human rights.

We all know the United States faces a multitude of threats at home and abroad, from Russia's cyber attack on our elections, to North Korea's continued belligerence, to new questions about America's leadership in the world. But even as Congress rightly remains focused on these challenges, we must not lose sight of Iran's ongoing, ever-growing efforts to exert more control, more power, and more influence throughout the Middle East. Whether we are talking about an adversary like Russia or Iran or an international challenge like climate change or the refugee crisis, we cannot let issues of such importance to our future be obscured by partisan politics, derailed by divisive tweets, or lost amid the revelations of our relentless 24-hour news cycle.

I have always believed politics must stop at the water's edge, and I know many of my colleagues share that principle. That is why there is such broad bipartisan support for the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act. I am pleased to have worked with Senators CORKER, CARDIN, and a number of other colleagues on legislation that has earned the support of nearly 60 cosponsors. We crafted this legislation by listening to an array of different voices with experience addressing Iran's destabilizing influence.

But let me be clear. This bill is not—is not—about Iran's nuclear program. This bill is not about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. With the regime's tentacles reaching across the region—from its support of a Shia proxy network in Iraq, to its growing influence in Afghanistan, to its continued sponsorship of terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas—we need a strategic approach, one that energizes our partners in the region and recognizes their capacity to counter Iran's behavior. That is exactly what the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act does.

Our legislation calls on the President of the United States to develop a regional strategy to counter Iran's asymmetric and conventional threats across the Middle East. We know that Iran, for example, continues to develop sophisticated ballistic missile technologies. They aren't exactly hiding it. Just a few weeks ago, a semi-official news service for the Iranian Revolutionary Guard announced it had built a third underground facility dedicated to ballistic missiles. Iran continues to test launch missiles, some of which may be capable of reaching Europe or Israel—both critical allies of the United States. In fact, some of the missiles launched earlier this year had the words ''Israel must be wiped off the Earth'' etched on their sides. That is why S. 722 requires the President to impose sanctions on any person who knowingly engages and materially contributes in support of Iran's ballistic missiles program.

Some argue that imposing new sanctions on Iran violates the spirit of the JCPOA, but I would argue that actively building underground ballistic missile facilities does little to promote good will or the spirit of the JCPOA in the region.

Beyond its missile program, Iran remains actively engaged in importing and exporting small and conventional arms to terrorist proxies around the world and bad actors like North Korea. In January of this year, the outgoing United Nations Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon, expressed concern that Iran might have violated an arms embargo by supplying weapons and missiles to Hezbollah. Yet, not all of Iran's violations make high-profile news. We know Iran has ramped up its supply of weapons to the Houthi rebels in Yemen and other proxies throughout the region. That is why this legislation imposes sanctions on any individual who knowingly engages in activity that materially contributes to the supply, sale, or transfer of arms as defined and established by U.N. standards.

Finally, when it comes to human rights, some try to paint a pretty picture of reform in Iran, but a closer look reveals chilling and deplorable human rights abuses. According to Human Rights Watch, by October of last year, Iran had executed more than 250 people—that is 1 person sent to death every day—and many were executed for nonviolent drug offenses. That is why our legislation expands the scope of violations eligible for sanctions, including those behind the extrajudicial killings of journalists and activists who seek to expose the oppression of the Iranian people.

Finally, this bill calls for a comprehensive report on Americans who suffer at the hands of the Iranian regime, including those who have been unjustly detained and those who have remained missing in Iran for more than a decade.

In short, this bill is a carefully crafted response to Iran's ongoing aggression in the Middle East.

Let me turn to a provision that continues to be misrepresented, and that

involves the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps. The IRGC is officially responsible for Iran's internal security, with a ground force of about 100,000, but like many other quasi-military-political entities in undemocratic countries throughout the world, the IRGC holds enormous influence in Iran's economy and public affairs. On paper, the IRGC Quds Force is the lead supporter of Iran's terrorist networks around the world, and the United States has designated it as such, but the reality is, the IRGC exercises tremendous economic and political power throughout Iran. It pulls the regime's levers to fund and support terrorists in the Middle East and beyond. That is why our bill specifically calls for terrorism-related sanctions on the IRGC, but it does not—let me repeat—it does not, as some have claimed, label the IRGC a foreign terrorist organization. We heard the concerns of our military and intelligence community. Let me repeat. This bill does not label the IRGC as a foreign terrorist organization. What it does do is require the President to acknowledge the role the IRGC plays in supporting terrorism globally.

I know some of my colleagues have expressed concerns as well about whether this bill gives a green light to the administration's decidedly confrontational approach to Iran, but that is precisely why Congress must step up and define our strategy in the Middle East. We need to look at the big picture here. As the United States and our partners work to build democratic governance structures—promote tolerance across the region and protect civilians and refugees living under siege—Iran remains aligned with Russia and Syria, actively working to undermine U.S. security interests. Indeed, Putin, Assad, and the Ayatollah continue to take advantage of the strife that imperils the region. Meanwhile, the world continues to struggle with extremism, with mass migration, and with the largest humanitarian crisis since World War II.

With this administration unable to articulate a clear vision for American leadership in the world, the time is ripe for Congress to assert its influence in our foreign policy, to provide guidance and expertise, and to develop a framework for securing our interests in the Middle East.

Now is not the time for Congress to turn a blind eye to Iran's hostile behavior. Now is the time for all of us to demand nothing less than vigorous oversight, constant vigilance, and strict enforcement of our entire arsenal of diplomatic tools, including sanctions on Iran. That is our effort—outside of the nuclear proposal—to make it very clear that you cannot get a green light to do all of these things just because you signed on to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. I think it is important for us to send this message, and when the appropriate time comes for this vote, I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, for a number of years, we have been debating healthcare in this country. Clearly, our healthcare system had problems 8 years ago when they started to do healthcare reform. I saw that as a doctor practicing in Casper, WY.

Well, then Washington Democrats tried their solution. It is a solution that passed, and it is known as ObamaCare. Republicans said that it wouldn't work and have been proven right. ObamaCare is too costly. It is collapsing. It is interesting because yesterday, as we were having our policy lunch meetings—Republicans and Democrats—word came out that another one of the ObamaCare exchange companies, Anthem, this time in Ohio, was pulling out, leaving about 18 counties, if not more in Ohio, without anybody to sell insurance on the ObamaCare exchange.

ObamaCare actually hasn't solved the problems of America's healthcare system. In many ways, it has made matters worse. That is why the law has never really had the support of the American people and continues to be unpopular today. It is why more than 19 million people actually chose not to sign up for ObamaCare coverage at all, even in spite of financial incentives to do so and a fine or a tax if you didn't sign up. So they either paid the fine or they got an exemption.

The Democrats, when they come to the floor to talk about healthcare, refuse to talk about those 19 million people who have just said: We want nothing to do with ObamaCare. We are not going to sign up. Give us an exemption. Let us out.

They want to talk about people whom they actually have covered by pushing them into a broken Medicaid system, and that is about what has happened here. This expansion through the healthcare law and expanding Medicaid put many people into a broken healthcare system called Medicaid. It wasn't working well before ObamaCare, and it has gotten worse. The numbers out there, in terms of physicians taking care of patients, are about one-third—one out of three doctors will not take new Medicaid patients, so it is not a system that is working. It is not a solution, but Democrats put more people into that.

For people who didn't end up in Medicaid and who paid their premiums, those premiums have gone up significantly. They have doubled in most States, I think, across the board—up about 107 percent over the last 4 years. Thus, the statistics that have come out from the Department of Health and Human Services recently are the statistics the Obama administration, as it left office, didn't want the American people to see—that rates have doubled across the country and, in some States, much, much higher than that.

In my home State of Wyoming, they were up actually higher than the national average has been. People are paying more and more. There were two companies, at one point, that were selling insurance on the ObamaCare exchange, both losing money. One lost so much that they are no longer in business. The other is still losing money and still selling on the exchange, but you wonder how long they will stay. Or will they do the sort of thing that Anthem had to do in Ohio and the sorts of things we have seen in the Presiding Officer's home State of Iowa and we have seen in Nebraska and we have seen across the board? Some Democrats say: This is a one-term correction; give it time. But it doesn't seem that it is going to be working that way.

There was an article in the paper here, in Washington's Roll Call, and the headline was—this was last week—''Insurers Seek Increases for Obamacare Premiums in Early Filings.'' This is for next year. The article talks about how the insurance companies are starting to say how much they are going to need to charge people next year, which is much higher than it is this year. They are talking about an average increase of about 30 percent.

The average premium in the ObamaCare market in Wyoming right now is already more than $7,000 a year for a family. So how much more can people take? That is why I continue to come to the floor and talk about what is the problem with the healthcare law—healthcare and the system. People under ObamaCare have seen their deductibles go up, their copays go up, and the choices that they have go down. This is the real problem when we talk about ObamaCare.

Then, of course, the other thing is taxes. There are at least 15 new or higher taxes under ObamaCare. So people aren't just paying higher premiums; they are paying higher taxes, which were supposed to help with the premiums, but it doesn't seem to be doing so for people all across the country.

The Congressional Budget Office has looked at this, and it said that Americans are going to pay more than $28 billion over the next 10 years on just one tax on prescription drugs. Well, if we are trying to lower the cost of drugs and trying to lower the cost of care, putting a tax like this, as ObamaCare did on prescription drugs, just adds to the problem.

It has raised taxes all across the board. I don't want to go through each and every one of the taxes, but suffice it to say that when President Obama said he would put this program into place and it wouldn't cost a single

dime, he forgot the trillion dollars in new taxes that he added onto the backs of hard-working Americans. So we have had higher taxes, we have had higher premiums, we have had higher out-of-pocket costs from people—this huge tax burden.

What has happened is that we need to do a reform. The House has passed reform, and now in the Senate we are working on passing our own healthcare reform bill. We have been meeting three times a week up to over 5 hours a week for the last month and a half, going through piece by piece of all the different components of the healthcare law, trying to address the issues that are facing the American people, trying to lower the taxes that top the list of what we hear about at home in terms of trying to help people because they are paying more taxes, trying to work to deal with premiums.

I am really encouraged by the debate we have been having. I think we have been taking good steps in trying to address the issues the American public is seeing in terms of higher premiums and fewer choices.

I would like to work with the Democrats to solve these problems in a bipartisan way, to talk about how people can actually get healthcare in this country. But what have the Democrats done in response? Well, it is interesting because they want to go to a single-payer healthcare system. Some may deny it, but a majority of the Democrats in the House have cosponsored legislation to go to a single-payer healthcare plan. It is modeled, in some ways, after what you are seeing in California.

The California State Senate last week passed a bill, which seems to be the drift and the direction and maybe even the tip of the sphere of the Democratic Party efforts. It said: We want single-payer healthcare in California.

I served in the Wyoming State Senate, and I know the Presiding Officer served in the State legislative body in her home State of Iowa. We do a fiscal note. We say: What is this going to cost? Is it a good idea? Can we afford it? What are the costs going to be? And the cost for what they proposed in California is $400 billion. Can they afford it? What is the total budget of the State of California? What is their general fund for the year? It is only $190 billion. So what they are proposing for healthcare alone is over twice what the entire general fund for the entire State of California is. Yet, it passed. It was a party-line vote in the State of California in the State senate, but that is now the position that they are working to do.

So it is hard to get cooperation from somebody to work on dealing with a healthcare plan when their plan is to go with more government, more spending, pledging money they don't have. When I looked at it in California, I said: If they want to do this, they will have to, No. 1, cut spending on other things. When you think about where general funding goes, it is for teachers, law enforcement, public safety, and firefighters. But they would also have to raise taxes significantly to get the money for what they want to promise everybody in this single-payer healthcare plan.

I am interested in working in a bipartisan way with people, but it is hard to get cooperation from people when their solution is more government, higher taxes, and less freedom. We need a solution, and that is what we are working on. I am very happy to say that it has been discussed at length in our conference. We had another good meeting about it yesterday, along with the Vice President, focusing on eliminating taxes, getting rid of the mandate that says that people must buy a government-approved product, giving people additional choices, and giving the States flexibility to make a number of these decisions.

I am from a State where agriculture plays a significant role, as is the Presiding Officer. I will be at our Wyoming stock growers' meeting on Friday when I am back home in the State. I was there a couple of years ago after ObamaCare passed, talking to people who had insurance that worked for them and worked for their families, but they lost it, not because they couldn't afford to pay for what they had but because what President Obama and the Democrats forced through in Congress said it wasn't good enough for them.

Under the mandate, as to what my friends and neighbors and folks around Wyoming have been saying was good enough for them and they could afford, President Obama said it wasn't good enough for them. Who is the better judge of what is good for a family in Iowa or Wyoming—President Obama and the Democrats or the family there in Iowa or Wyoming who is making the decision about what works best for them and their families? I am sure I am going to hear more about it at the stock growers' meeting on Friday, when I hear from families who say: What we had worked, but lost it because it wasn't allowed to be sold anymore. The President said it wasn't good enough for me. One woman said to me: Tell the President that I can make the decisions for myself. I don't need his help—referring to President Obama.

So we will continue to work toward the goal of making sure that we have people who can get the insurance and care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs. That is what we needed with healthcare reform. That is what we didn't get with ObamaCare. We got higher costs and fewer choices. Across the board right now, it looks like in 7 out of 10 counties in this country, people are down to one or two choices—hardly a market. In many places it is a monopoly now. After the news that came out yesterday from Anthem in Ohio and some of the news that we see from Iowa and neighboring Nebraska, we are going to find that many places will find themselves with no options available. Even with the subsidies that the Democrats had promised to help deal with the high premiums they have caused, there may be nobody to sell the insurance even when the subsidies are available.

So I come to the floor, as I do just about every week, to talk about the situation with the Obama healthcare law, the challenges the American people face, and our commitment to help provide relief and rescue the American people from what has happened to them under President Obama's healthcare law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the most important words in our Constitution are the first three—''We the People''—written in a beautiful script and written in a font size so that one can see it from across the room. They set out the mission statement for our Constitution, for our vision of government—not government of, by, and for the privileged and the powerful but government of, by, and for the people, as President Lincoln so eloquently summarized.

It is our responsibility as elected officials to look out for decisions that serve this mission of government of, by, and for the people, to fight in times of trouble for policies that provide a ladder of opportunity and a foundation for families to thrive. But at this very moment, a secret group of 13 Senators is devising a healthcare plan with the intention of bringing it to this floor with no public debate, no committee meeting, and no public notice. They want to just bring it to the floor, have a few hours of debate, and put it forward, even though it will affect millions of Americans. It probably will hurt millions of Americans, but the secret 13 want to craft this policy. And why in secret? Because they are plotting a plan that will hurt so many people, they don't want the public involved in the process. They don't want to hear from the citizens from rural America or urban America who are so concerned about the TrumpCare bill—the bill that will immediately destroy healthcare for 14 million Americans; the bill that will immediately undermine the solvency and success of our rural healthcare clinics and our rural hospitals; the bill that breaks every promise the President put forward on healthcare.

It breaks the promise that every person will be covered, breaks the promise that people with preexisting connections will get the same price as everyone else, breaks the promise that the

policies will be even better, higher quality. Instead, it guts the essential benefits. It breaks the promise that the insurance will be at a lower cost. In fact, for someone roughly 64 years of age earning about $26,500, their healthcare bill would go from $140 a month to $1,200 a month—a sum that is clearly impossible to pay on an annual income of $26,500. That is why it is being done in secret—because it involves broken promise after broken promise, destroying healthcare in every town and hamlet across America.

That is quite a contrast to the way ObamaCare was forged. ObamaCare had a yearlong debate. It proceeded to be in committee markup—that means with amendments being offered—in the HELP Committee for about 5 weeks, with television cameras rolling and 150 Republican amendments accepted during that process. Then the Finance Committee had its turn, and it had a very long markup, and it had dozens and dozens, if not 100 or more, Republican amendments adopted. The debate was all over the country. It was in the newspapers. It was in every forum. It was right there, square center, nothing hidden. But this is quite different. The majority leader today has started the rule XIV process, specifically intending to bypass those Senate committees and bring the TrumpCare bill to the Senate floor, completely bypassing government of, by, and for the people.

This is unacceptable. I think my colleagues know it is unacceptable, but they are hoping to do it so quickly and so fast that they will have a minimum of criticism across the country. There should be a maximum amount of criticism on the floor of the Senate. Every Senator who believes that this democracy—this democratic Republic—is one in which we do the people's work should see the light of day. The debate should see the light of day in the forging of the bill, as well as the final debate here on the floor.

We know another reason this bill—this replacement or addition or modification of the House bill—is being crafted in secret. That is because the very premise of it is to give a massive tax break to the wealthiest Americans, another promise broken in which Trump said that this would not be done. But there it is, TrumpCare out of the House, $600 billion given away to the richest Americans while devastating healthcare for working Americans.

Has no one noticed that we have an incredible gap in income in this country, with massive numbers of people earning very little and a few at the top earning massive amounts? Has no one noticed that we have a huge wealth gap in this Nation, with those at the bottom having few, if any, savings and those at the top having billions upon billions? If we have noticed, then we should care that that is not a foundation for families to thrive. Indeed, it is something that is only made much worse in a bill that takes away the foundation of healthcare—essentially, the quality of life for families across America—and, in turn, takes the savings and gives it to the wealthiest families.

There is a reason to hide this bill. There are a lot of reasons to hide this bill. But it is undemocratic to have this secret group developing this bill with an intention to bring it to the floor without a committee hearing, without public exposure.

Folks back home are very worried, and I would like to share a few of their stories.

Lynda of Talent, OR, who survived her battle with stomach cancer, thanks to the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid expansion—Lynda's friend wrote to share her story. Lynda was a self-employed plumber, working hard to get her business off the ground, but she was diagnosed with stage IV stomach cancer. Lynda couldn't afford insurance, and she and her husband couldn't afford to pay for treatment out of pocket because they were already paying off enormous debt from care her husband had received.

So what did Lynda do? She ignored the symptoms. She tried to go about her life as best as she could. As her friend wrote, ''She would have died rather than take on more debt that she was not sure she could pay.'' But that changed with the Affordable Care Act the day Lynda found out she would receive coverage under the Oregon Health Plan—Oregon's Medicaid expansion.

Now there is good news to share. Lynda received treatment. She has been cancer-free for almost a year, and her friend describes this as ''nothing short of a miracle.'' ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, delivered a miracle to an individual who was planning just to die rather than get treatment and then could get treatment, thanks to Medicaid expansion, and is now in remission.

TrumpCare is being reworked in secret by 13 of my colleagues out of public sight. It wants to strip away that expansion of Medicaid, wants to rip away the chance for people like Lynda to receive lifesaving care.

Yvonne from Elmira, OR, sent a note to us about the high-risk pools that Republicans want to institute under TrumpCare. She says:

> Before the ACA existed, I was in our state's high risk pool because no company would insure me because I had Asthma and had an ovary removed because of cysts.
>
> The $1500 deductible and $550 per month was hard to pay and then it only covered 70%.
>
> When I was severely injured in an accident and required reconstructive surgery I ended up bankrupt.

But then, 2 years ago, she qualified for the Oregon Health Plan. Now Yvonne has her medical needs covered at an affordable price and can't be denied coverage or charged a higher premium because of her preexisting conditions. Yvonne, like so many others, would suffer under the Republican plan to strip away the protection for preexisting conditions. She has had an accident, she has had an ovary removed, she has had asthma. It would be extraordinarily difficult for her to get insurance without the protection of everyone being in the same healthcare pool together. If she could get insurance—which is not at all clear—it would be at sky-high, unaffordable prices.

Bernard from Portland wrote to us. He said that an important thing that often gets lost in this whole debate over the future of the Affordable Care Act is the support it gives for Americans to innovate.

In 2011, Bernard in Portland chose to leave his job and pursue his passion of becoming a freelance artist. Here is what he said, in his words:

> With my departure, I left behind the security of medical coverage. For two years, I was not covered by medical insurance, and fortunately nothing happened, but that is a gamble nobody should have to take. And it's a gamble that I could take being under 40 years old, and in relatively good health.
>
> A person should not have to stay in a job they may not even like, and could be better filled by someone else, just for fear of not having medical coverage.

He is right. One of the powerful things that has occurred under ObamaCare is that individuals worked for firms and wanted to become entrepreneurs but were afraid to do so because of the loss of healthcare coverage, but now, either through the expansion of Medicaid or through the exchanges, they can acquire insurance without being part of a large company. That has unleashed entrepreneurship across the country. People are pursuing their dreams and contributing to the economy in all kinds of ways because they can now access healthcare without being part of a company that provides healthcare.

Eventually, Bernard was able to afford a basic coverage plan. But it didn't provide much, and it cost a significant portion of his income, but it all changed with the ACA.

An October 2016 survey of American small businesses and a January 2017 followup survey found that one-third of 5,400 small business owners interviewed had the confidence to start their own businesses because they had access to healthcare through the ACA. According to the Department of Labor, between 2013 when the ACA went into effect and the end of 2015, the number of self-employed Americans increased by 3.5 percent.

These are just different ways of noting what we hear about all the time—people launching their entrepreneurial efforts, launching their companies because of the confidence they have that they can get healthcare. That is the powerful unleashing of creativity. It is an economic engine. It is a small business driver.

Lisa from Phoenix also wrote to share her powerful story. Lisa's daughter suffers from cerebral palsy and epilepsy, so Lisa has stayed home and

cared for her for the last 15 years while her husband worked. Now, thanks to ACA's Medicaid expansion, her family has been able to hire in-home help and it has been transformative.

Lisa's daughter has become more connected to the community, gained new skills and independence, is contributing to household chores, and has shown a great deal more vitality and engagement since the family was able to get some assistance. It has gotten to the point where Lisa can start thinking about her own needs a bit more. In fact, for the first time in quite a while, she is considering taking on a job outside her home to help provide more income.

The ACA isn't just saving lives in emergency health situations or by addressing diseases. It is improving the quality of life for millions of American families like Lisa's.

I will share one more constituent story today. It is hard to pick just one more because there are so many stories coming in each and every day. As we continue to talk about the assault on the health and peace of mind of millions of Americans, I will be coming back to the floor to share those stories coming in from other Oregonians. But this last story comes from Warren in Tigard, OR.

Warren and his wife Joyce have been happily married for over 60 years, but in the last few years, Joyce has been suffering from Alzheimer's. Joyce's disease has progressed very far. Among other things, she has lost her mobility, much of her cognition, and she is wheelchair bound. Her condition has progressed so far that Warren and the home caregivers who were helping him care for his wife just couldn't meet the need requirements any longer, so they admitted Joyce to a nearby adult care facility, where she is now secure, stable, and comfortable. But, as we know, the kind of care Joyce is receiving is expensive. Warren writes:

> This care costs $4,000 per month. Our long-term care insurance is currently covering most of this cost, but only about 4 months' worth of insurance coverage remains. So we will have to obtain Medicaid coverage for her continued care.
>
> But proposed changes to the Affordable Care Act could jeopardize this coverage. I have not anticipated this disastrous change, but fear it would be a tragedy for both of us.

Yes, it would be a tragedy for Warren and for Joyce to have TrumpCare pass and dismantle Medicaid and dismantle the exchanges. It would be a tragedy for so many others in similar situations across the country.

Many people don't realize that Medicaid helps pay for nursing home care for more than half of the nursing home residents—residents like Joyce. But here is TrumpCare, planning to cut $880 billion in direct Medicaid spending. It is basically: Well, too bad Warren and too bad Joyce. We want to save some money so we can give big tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans.

I must say, there is not a lot of caring in that perspective. It embodies a principle, but is it really the principle we want in the United States of America—the principle that the goal of the majority party is to take away from those who have little to give more to those who have most? Is that really the principle my Republican colleagues want to embrace on the floor of the Senate?

Is that really the principle the secret 13 with their secret meetings out of public sight to develop a new version of TrumpCare want to embrace? I would suggest that is simply wrong. It is wrong from the point of view of providing an opportunity for all Americans to thrive. It is wrong from a moral point of view to pull healthcare—and the peace of mind that comes with healthcare—out of the hands of struggling Americans and working Americans across our country.

Finally, I want to address one more issue. We heard earlier today that Anthem is pulling out of Ohio. Why are they pulling out? Because of President Trump. Why is that connected? Because he refuses to confirm that his administration will make the cost-sharing reduction payments that have been part of the Affordable Care Act. Those payments reduce the premiums. Those payments proceed also to reduce the level of deductibles so you get more care sooner. So insurance companies don't know whether to raise their insurance policy a little or a tremendous amount, and that instability means they simply can't price their policies.

In addition, my Republican colleagues have assaulted the risk quarters, or reinsurance programs, that make it possible for an insurance company to go into a new market and know that if they get a disproportionate share of sick patients, they will get compensated for that risk and that result. So that reinsurance is essential for more companies to be in a particular market.

Moreover, the administration proceeded to not spend the money on advertising in the last stage of signups and reduced the number of people who were in the markets. So that is another assault on the stability of health insurance in America. This is a deliberate, straight-out effort to undermine healthcare in America to the disadvantage of millions of Americans. It is being done by the President without any action even happening on TrumpCare here in the Senate. It is wrong. It is hurting a lot of people, and the President should stop.

With that, I conclude my comments.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask permission to speak under leadership time for a brief moment.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

With respect to the pending vote on the Iran sanctions bill, I want to be very clear. Democrats will vote to advance this bill to the floor because most of us support the bill but also because we expect an amendment process that will follow for a vote on a strong package of Russia sanctions. I have talked to the Republican leader about this. He is amenable to that.

Our Republican colleagues should realize it will be very difficult to gather Democratic support for final passage of this bill until we deal with Russia sanctions. We feel strongly that we need a tough, effective package of Russia sanctions to move alongside the Iran sanctions. We are currently negotiating to that end. I have faith that the majority leader and I, along with Chairman CORKER, Chairman CRAPO, Ranking Member CARDIN, and Ranking Member BROWN, will be able to agree on a way forward that allows for a final vote on Iran sanctions alongside a strong and effective package of Russia sanctions.

With that, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

> We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.
>
> Todd Young, Joni Ernst, Bill Cassidy, Ron Johnson, Tom Cotton, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, Mitch McConnell, Richard Burr, Luther Strange, James M. Inhofe, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, John Cornyn, Bob Corker, John Barrasso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 91, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 140 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Alexander	Gardner	Nelson
Baldwin	Graham	Perdue
Barrasso	Grassley	Peters
Bennet	Harris	Portman
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Booker	Heinrich	Roberts
Boozman	Heitkamp	Rounds
Brown	Heller	Rubio
Burr	Hirono	Sasse
Cantwell	Hoeven	Schatz
Capito	Inhofe	Schumer
Cardin	Isakson	Scott
Casey	Johnson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kaine	Shelby
Cochran	Kennedy	Stabenow
Collins	King	Strange
Coons	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Corker	Lankford	Tester
Cornyn	Leahy	Thune
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	Markey	Van Hollen
Daines	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Duckworth	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Flake	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—8

Carper	Gillibrand	Sanders
Durbin	Merkley	Udall
Feinstein	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 91, the nays are 8.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 140, I voted yea. It was my intention to vote nay. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome of the vote.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues to speak about the need to ensure that the policies that we make in this Chamber work for and support rural America.

Senators STABENOW, HEITKAMP, and I are all from the Midwest—the heartland. We represent the people who are truly in the middle of this country—the middle of the country economically, politically—and who are often middle-income people who need representatives who are focused on what matters to them.

Each year I visit all 87 counties in my State, and I hear a lot. I hear about dads who can't be sure their sons or daughters will have the support they need to take over the family farm when the time comes, small business owners who can't get a broadband connection, moms who can't figure out how to pay for their kids' prescriptions when the costs go up, and manufacturers who can't find workers to fill jobs.

Rural America has been left behind. The poverty rate in their areas for kids is higher than it is in urban areas. Businesses may not invest when they can't get reliable internet access or they can't get the right people to support their operation. Housing is hard to come by.

We should be focused on supporting our farmers and ensuring that people can raise a family in a small town and have the healthcare they need. We should be making sure that high-quality education is attainable and that job training options are available and affordable. We should be able to provide every person in this country with a clear path to a good job.

Unfortunately, from the administration we have seen a disconnect between rhetoric and policy. We have seen a budget that hits the heartland with 21 percent cuts in the Department of Agriculture—cuts to grant programs that support rural homeownership, provide clean drinking water and wastewater systems, and promote access to critical services such as rural hospitals. It eliminates rural business programs that help create hundreds of thousands of jobs. If enacted, these cuts would have a damaging impact on rural communities throughout the country.

Rural communities help our country get ahead. They are the backbone of our country. We need to work to find common ground on these issues, and we need a budget that helps and not hurts the heartland.

I see my colleague from Michigan, Senator STABENOW, is here as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to first thank my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR. She is a very important part of our Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee. She provides tremendous leadership. We both come from great ''M'' States. So it is always great to have an opportunity to be part of sharing remarks on such an important topic. I am also pleased to state that Senator HEITKAMP will be joining us today, as well, from another very important rural State.

Michigan small towns and rural communities embody much of our State's way of life and drive our economy forward. I grew up in one of those small towns, in Clare, in Northern Michigan. I believe that towns like mine should be celebrated and strengthened. We want young people to go to college and feel that there is a future to come home to, either back to the farm or the small business or participating in the community or maybe working at the local hospital, but being part of continuing this important way of life.

People in our communities deserve every opportunity to be able to raise their families with well-paying jobs and a high quality of life, like everyone in every part of Michigan and all across the country wants to have, but many rural areas and many small towns face unique challenges in developing and maintaining infrastructure.

Broadband. We now need to make sure that the farm at the end of the road is connected with high-speed internet. At one point in our country's history, it was the telephone. It was electric poles and being able to connect the farm at the end of the road to the rest of the community. Now it is high-speed broadband, and it is critically important that that happen.

Providing high-quality health services and education. My mother was a nurse—the director of nursing—at the small hospital in Clare for many, many years. So I know how important not only healthcare was and making sure there were doctors in our town but also making sure there were jobs, because one of the top employers in our community was the hospital. That remains true today.

When the Trump administration released its budget proposal at the end of the month, frankly, I was shocked to see the kinds of disinvestments and sharp cuts that would hurt small towns like Clare and rural communities all across Michigan and all across the country. No matter which part you look at, President Trump's budget is bad for rural Michigan, and it is bad for rural America.

First, the budget calls for a 21-percent cut to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is our second largest industry. One out of four jobs in Michigan is connected to agriculture and the food economy. In the President's budget, it was decided that the third largest cut to any Federal agency would be in the Department of Agriculture. This will dramatically reduce and eliminate very key rural development services.

The budget would zero out funding for water and sewer infrastructure projects, which is amazing to me. I can drive from one end of Michigan to the other and see communities in which rural development has made all the difference in supporting the ability to have clean water and water and sewer systems, as well as other important infrastructure. This program has improved nearly 6,000 rural water systems, including many in Michigan. There is an extremely high demand for upgrading water and sewer systems across the country. Right now, the USDA has a backlog of nearly 1,000 applications from small towns that need to improve their water systems.

President Trump's answer, as part of his infrastructure package, is to say that this will come from not supporting rural communities ourselves but leaving it up to Wall Street investors or, maybe, foreign countries to invest in our water systems, like Saudi Arabia or China. The fact is that Wall Street investors are not investing in rural communities. I would argue that that is not a good strategy anyway. We know that, when you depend on that kind of a strategy—foreign country investor or Wall Street investor efforts—

those investments are not being done in small towns like the one in which I grew up. Towns with populations of a few hundred people cannot afford the high interest rates—or the toll roads, by the way—that come with a lot of the projects in this kind of approach.

The budget also undermines rural jobs and businesses in communities in which unemployment is already too high. The USDA's small business loans are eliminated under the President's budget. Again, I can go from community to community around Michigan and see wonderful small businesses operating with the support of rural development loans. These are programs that have saved almost 800,000 jobs and have helped finance more than 107,000 businesses in the last 8 years alone.

This proposal that the White House put out also jeopardizes what I talked about earlier, which is rural broadband, or high-speed internet, for communities in order to access education, rural healthcare, and telemedicine, as well as addressing issues like resources to curb the opioid epidemic. Last year, the FCC found that 39 percent of rural Americans—that is, roughly, 23 million people—lack access to high-speed internet service. This is astounding to me when we look at this as a challenge that we have in 2017.

President Trump's budget also targets the farm bill directly for $231 billion in cuts. We work together on a strategy for a 5-year economic development plan. We do it on a bipartisan basis. It will be time to bring that up again next year. That 5-year process gives certainty to our farmers and communities and those interested and committed to conservation and bioenergy and all of the other provisions in the farm bill. To see—outside of this 5-year period and our bipartisan process—the Trump administration come in and target these funds for a cut of $231 billion, again, is shocking to me. If that were to pass, it would be impossible for us to write the next farm bill next year.

Cutting crop insurance by $29 billion would take away critical support for farmers right at a time of low commodity prices. We moved from subsidies to risk management in crop insurance in the last bill, saving taxpayer dollars. We made a commitment to farmers purchasing insurance, where they are writing a check for the insurance bill instead of getting a subsidy during good times, but you have the insurance if there is a weather event, if commodity prices are low, if there is another challenge like we are seeing today for our farmers.

Our farmers also need export opportunities in order to sell their products, which are in high demand around the world. We have to be able to sell agricultural products. The budget eliminates important market-access programs to help our farmers sell. Simply put, cuts to these programs mean lower economic growth, less development, less opportunity, and a lower quality of life in small towns in Michigan and all across rural America.

Our small towns and rural communities deserve better, and we are standing here today as advocates and voices for them. We know, as farm prices are down nearly 50 percent from their highs just a few years ago and producers are struggling to make ends meet, that these are challenging times, and we need to understand that. We need to write a farm bill and focus on those areas to support our farmers and growers. We know there are those like our dairy farmers, in particular, who are in challenging times, and we need to make sure we are addressing their concerns as well.

Rural America is the economic backbone of the country. Somebody has to grow something, and somebody has to make something. Otherwise, you do not have an economy. That is what happens in rural Michigan and rural America. Yet we also know that too many communities are still struggling to recover from the great recession.

From my perspective, I join with the 500 groups from every part of agriculture, the food economy, nutrition, and conservation groups—everyone involved in the food economy—in saying that we cannot afford additional cuts to agriculture, rural communities, and other parts of the farm bill that support our ongoing economy.

It is critically important that we stand with those in every small town in Michigan and across our country in saying that we understand and are partners with you in making sure that, when you work hard, you have the quality of life for yourself and your family that you deserve, and we are going to do our part to make sure that support is there.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, while I join Senator STABENOW in her remarks, I want to thank her for her tremendous leadership on the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee and for working across the aisle with Chairman ROBERTS. The two of them, I have no doubt, will be able to come to an agreement and keep working on getting an even stronger farm bill. It took some Herculean efforts to get the last farm bill done, and it would not have happened without her. I appreciate what she said about the importance of the farm bill and the USDA.

I would also add another important pillar of strong rural economics, and that is job training.

Starting with high school, I think we all have to come to grips with the fact that not every kid wants to get a 4-year degree. In fact, we have so many openings across this country—millions of job openings—whether it be on a plant floor, whether it be as a plumber or as a welder, that can be obtained with a 1-year or a 2-year degree. My own sister did not graduate from high school. She went on, years later, and got her GED, and then she went on to get a 2-year degree. After that, she got 2 more years of training and became an accountant. There is not just one path in America.

Part of this is investing in STEM—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—and doing it early so that kids get a jump start on the jobs of tomorrow. By the way, this is not just your Ph.D.s and Silicon Valley jobs. This also includes blue-collar jobs. I call it blue STEM. There is a shortage, as I said, of welders and auto mechanics, and those can be good-paying jobs. We need to talk about them with dignity, and we have to realize that this is where the openings are.

The other piece of this, in addition to training kids in high school, is to make sure we have apprenticeship programs available. This year, a report came out in my State that 68 percent of Minnesota manufacturers found it was difficult for them to find workers with the right skills and experience. That is up from 40 percent in 2010.

I see that Senator HEITKAMP is here. As they are starting to add some more jobs in the oil patch in North Dakota, it is going to become even harder to find Minnesotans to fill some of our jobs because some of them like to go over to North Dakota.

Senator COLLINS and I have introduced a bill called the American Apprenticeship Act, which would expand tuition assistance for pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs. The President has talked about workforce development as being a priority. Yet we have seen a cut of 15 percent in Department of Education grants for career and technical education, as well as a 36-percent cut to Labor Department funding for training and employment services.

As I noted before, there is this disconnect between the rhetoric we hear and what we are reading in the black and white of this budget. I know there are people on both sides of the aisle here, including the Senator from North Dakota, who want to work on bridging that difference and getting a good budget done that really helps rural America.

I see Senator HEITKAMP is here, and I thank her for coming. Senator HEITKAMP serves on the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee. She was an integral part of the last farm bill and will be an integral part of this as well as in really understanding the economics within a rural State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I thank my good friend the Senator from Minnesota. She just exists to the east of me. We share a common border, but we also share a common belief that Washington is not devoid of ideas. Somehow, it has just lost the capacity to bring those ideas to fruition. As my great friend the Senator from Minnesota can attest, there are hundreds—

and probably thousands—of great ideas for small business, for workers, for improving the economic conditions of people in this country that are here, ready for debate, and ready for passage.

What is not a formula for success for America is the budget. The President's budget would devastate rural communities. I am not given to hyperbole, and I am not given to exaggeration, but the absolute, bare fact is that this budget will decimate economic opportunity not only for American agriculture but for economic opportunity and security for rural communities.

When we think about North Dakota, it is hard to imagine a State that most of the people in this country would imagine more equated with rural America. I tease AMY many times when I tell her: Oh, it is coming up from the Cities, because our big opportunity to travel and to see the sites of the big city really is Minneapolis and St. Paul. But a lot of Minnesota—a lot of western Minnesota in particular, the area that I know about—is engaged in agriculture, and we share a common border, but we share a common purpose.

I wanted to start off by saying that in North Dakota, we understand the value of rural communities. We understand the value of investing in agriculture and infrastructure and how important those things are to boosting our local economy. We see the direct impacts of it on our families, businesses, and towns.

Most of us—me included—come from towns of fewer than 100 people. In fact, I am proud to say that growing up, there were nine people in my family, and my family was one-tenth of the population of the small town I lived in. We are proud of that. We are proud of our rural roots, and we are proud that from those life experiences growing up, we learned a lot about compromise, we learned a lot about work ethic, and we learned a lot about the importance of community and working together.

We also learned a lot about the importance of investment. Without critical investment, our rural communities are at risk, and I think that could have dramatic and drastic ramifications for our State, our counties, our families, and our neighbors. Instead of lifting up rural communities, the Presidential budget pushes us down.

Rural communities and the jobs there—including agriculture—are vital to many of the families I know but really families across the country. There are over 30,000 farmers and ranchers in North Dakota who lead the country in producing spring wheat, durum, sunflowers, canola, dry edible beans, flax, honey, and many more specialty crops and grain crops. These farmers feed North Dakota, our country, and the world.

In 2015, agriculture contributed more than $9.1 billion to my State's economy. That may not seem like a lot when we are talking about California, but that is a huge amount when we are talking about North Dakota.

About one-third of North Dakota's jobs are directly tied to agriculture. There are implement dealers, veterinarians, agriculture retailers, and many more who are closely associated with agribusiness. There are countless other jobs that support these rural communities, such as teachers, firefighters, police officers, and more.

Since the election, there has been a great deal of talk in Washington about rural America. I think rural America reared up its head in this past election and said ''We are not to be forgotten'' and they believed they had secured an advocate in Washington in this current administration, only to be basically told otherwise by a Presidential budget.

So what does the budget mean, and why should we pay attention to it? I think the first thing we need to know about a budget is that it is about priorities. It is really a values document. Unfortunately, the President's budget shows that the administration doesn't value North Dakota or really, in fact, rural America. In fact, it targets both.

Today I want to talk a little bit more specifically about how devastating this budget would be for rural communities across my State and across the country.

This budget would slash USDA's budget by over 21 percent, cutting $231 billion from funding from the farm bill over the next decade. It would specifically cut $29 billion—$29 billion—from crop insurance over the next decade. This is crop insurance our farmers rely on, especially at a time of challenging weather and low commodity prices. Crop insurance helps prevent family farms from going under when disaster strikes. Without an affordable crop insurance program, a drought or a flood could wipe out the wealth of an entire family and basically bankrupt a family farm.

When ranchers and farmers do well, North Dakota does well, and so will all the rest of the country. To challenge these farmers with a crop insurance program that will be nonexistent is to take away the opportunity for food security in this country—food security that is so closely linked and important to national security.

By drastically reducing field staff, the President's budget also prevents USDA from achieving its mission to support rural communities. The budget calls for reducing staffing levels at USDA by 5,200 employees. Nearly 2,500 of those employees are with the Farm Service Agency, Rural Development, and Natural Resources. What does that mean? The Farm Service Agency's caseloads have increased in North Dakota, and the current hiring ban has hampered efforts to administer the farm programs—those efforts which are critical to farmers as they make their business decisions.

I can't tell my colleagues the number of times farmers across my State have come up to me and said how grateful they are that the Farm Service Agency is available in their county and available to them to provide advice and much needed documentation on their decisionmaking on how they are going to implement the farm program.

In fact, I tease those farmers a little bit, because they always say: You know, that Farm Service gal—usually a woman who has been with the Agency over decades and knows that farm as well as that farmer, and when that farmer walks through the door to get that advice and to get that number, they know that not only do they have a friend sitting across the table from them—probably a neighbor—they also have an advocate sitting across the table. We don't want to lose that connection to this vital service, the Farm Service Agency, by making this about picking up the phone and pressing buttons and talking to someone who would barely even understand or even know North Dakota or the county the farmer is in. So at a time when farmers and ranchers are already experiencing low commodity prices, these cuts to the Farm Service Agency would limit the ability of that Agency to provide timely, accurate, and useful services to our family farmers and our ranchers.

The budget would create huge challenges for rural healthcare. On top of the $800-plus billion taken out of the Medicaid Program by the Republican healthcare bill, this budget would also cut $610 billion from Medicaid by reducing it to a block grant program.

Medicaid is a lifesaving, cost-effective program that enables more than 90,000 seniors, individuals and children with disabilities, and low-income families to get affordable, quality care.

I want my colleagues to think about the enormous challenge of delivering healthcare in a sparsely populated area. One of the challenges my rural healthcare providers have not had in the last many years since the implementation of the Affordable Care Act is uncompensated care. But when we go back to uncompensated care, on top of operating on razor-thin margins, we are now going to say that not only are you operating on razor-thin margins, but you are not going to have your bills paid, making it impossible for you to meet payroll and impossible for you to continue to provide these resources.

So we have real challenges in rural healthcare as a result of this budget and the Republican proposal.

The President's budget also cuts nearly $400 million in Federal funds for substance abuse prevention and behavioral health workforce training programs at the same time that every part of this country—particularly rural parts of our country—is facing opioid abuse. In North Dakota alone, fatalities from opioid abuse have grown 125 percent.

I met just yesterday with the North Dakota Medical Association, which told me that every day this week in Fargo, ND, there has been a death as a

result of overdoses. It is hard to imagine that is happening in our rural communities in places like North Dakota, but it is.

I talked to a healthcare provider in Dickinson, ND, who told me that while his average percentage of Medicaid recipients in his hospital is about 15 to 20 percent, as it relates to opioids and behavior and mental health, it is well over 60, bordering on 70 percent. So the population, without Medicaid dollars, would not be able to get important rehabilitation and treatment services.

Last week, I also visited one of our rural airports that are dependent on the Essential Air Service. That is absolutely critical to maintaining air service in Jamestown, in Devil's Lake, and now in Dickinson, which has gone back to Essential Air Service after years of not needing that support because of the growth in the Bakken oilfield.

Last week, while talking to the folks in Dickinson, they told me there are 475 jobs which are dependent on the airport, which helped generate $76.6 million for the area in 2015. The Dickinson Airport would receive about $4.2 million in assistance from the Essential Air Service each year, but when we look at how that investment pays off in terms of dividends, it seems like a small price to pay.

It would eliminate funding to protect water programs and infrastructure in rural areas which have improved water and wastewater systems for more than 40 North Dakota towns, Tribal reservations, and water districts since 2010.

This budget would also eliminate the Community Development Block Grant Program, which helped the State of North Dakota improve housing conditions for low- and moderate-income families with $4.9 million in investments in 2016.

It would eliminate the Economic Development Administration, which has provided over $34 million in investments since 2009 to local economic development organizations in North Dakota, particularly those in rural towns.

The list goes on and on and on. We haven't talked about the reduction in services for export markets. We haven't talked about research reductions at USDA and what that would mean. We haven't talked about eliminating trade assistance. All of these things have huge consequences for large pieces of the United States of America.

What I would say to the administration is that rural America expects better. Rural America thought they were going to get better than this. Rural America has enough challenges. We have volatile commodity prices, healthcare shortages, declining populations, and I will tell my colleagues that today in North Dakota, there is a potential disaster from drought. The President's budget would not only not help rural America thrive, it would only make matters worse.

Rather than taking an ax to proven, successful programs that strengthen our rural communities, we need strong investments in rural communities, jobs, and families, that help support North Dakota's future.

With this budget, the administration's priorities are clear for everyone to see. It is now Congress's job to set spending priorities and fund programs in rural America to a level so that we know rural America can not only survive but can thrive.

North Dakota needs and deserves a strong voice at the table. I will make sure that we tell the story of all of these programs, that we tell the story of how critically important these programs are to maintaining our opportunity to produce food in our country but also to raise our children in rural settings. It is beyond belief to me that we are in this situation given the level of support that rural America provided to this administration and to this President during the last election.

We know we can do better, and we will do better. We know we can't waste money. We know we have to deploy these valuable resources in ways that actually produce results. I can show my colleagues result after result after result and the importance of providing these services so that rural communities can thrive.

I will close with this: A little-known fact is that so many of our rural communities today are the most impoverished places in America. When people think of poverty, they think of inner city poverty, they think of other pieces of America they have seen, but we know that the rates of poverty, the rates of challenges in terms of healthcare, education—those challenges are much greater in rural America. The last thing we need to do is saddle rural America with a 500-pound rock, put it on their backs, and still expect them to thrive. This budget is a 500-pound rock on the backs of our farmers who work every day to put food on their table, but more importantly, work every day to feed America.

With that, I yield the floor and turn it back to my friend from the State of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I again thank Senator HEITKAMP for her understanding not just of farm policy but also the importance of keeping towns strong, manufacturing strong, and transportation strong.

I will note that the infrastructure portions of this budget are very concerning. The point has been made by others that right now, under the proposed budget, at a time when our deteriorating infrastructure is costing our economy a lot of money—not just congestion, not just potholes, but in delaying getting goods to market—unfortunately, this budget proposal would cut funding for vital transportation programs.

It will eliminate funding for the TIGER Grant Program. Currently, the program provides $500 million per year to help fund local transportation priorities. It eliminates funding for Essential Air Service, which helps support commercial air service to rural airports. It eliminates the Federal Transit Administration's Capital Investment Grant Program, which funds light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, street car, and bus rapid transit projects. We can't wait any longer to make critical investments in our infrastructure.

Probably right up there with any of these infrastructure needs in rural America is broadband. Internet access is a great equalizing force for creating jobs and leveling the playing field. There is a big digital gap when it comes to rural America. I know the percentages; close to 40 percent of Americans in rural areas do not have access to high-speed broadband. It used to be that slow speed would be OK if someone were trying to email their kid in school maybe 10, 15 years ago, but this is not true anymore. Now, if you want to do your work, if you want to go to the hospital—whatever you want to do in rural America, you are going to have to have high-speed internet.

I think about the doctor in Brainerd, MN, who for so long could look at x rays in the hospital but couldn't look at them in his home. If he had some emergency and wanted to talk to someone when he got home that evening, he had to go to the McDonald's parking lot to be able to do that.

There was a student at one of our reservations who got Wi-Fi in his house, looked out the window, and all of a sudden all these kids were doing their homework in his front yard. That is just not right. Rural Americans deserve equal footing so they can launch new businesses, export their goods, or just Skype with their loved ones.

This is about the farm bill, yes, but it is also about this budget and making sure this budget works for all Americans and leaves no one behind.

Sadly, these cuts are specifically targeted at rural America. That is why we are going to fight to make sure, hopefully on a bipartisan basis with colleagues on the Republican side, we produce a budget that is fair to everyone.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1305 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from New York.

(The remarks of Mrs. GILLIBRAND and Mr. CASSIDY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1313 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to bring two baskets of hemp products onto the floor of this body.

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

NATIONAL HEMP HISTORY WEEK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this is National Hemp History Week, a chance to recognize a product that has deep roots going way back in America but faces some of the most anti-farmer, anti-job, unjustifiable policies that are on the American legal books today. Because of its relation to marijuana, hemp can't legally be grown in American fields.

Now, hemp is harmless. Hemp grown for industrial use simply does not have marijuana psychoactive properties. You are going to get as high off hemp as you will off a bag of vegetables. But, still, farmers in Oregon and across the country can't legally grow it. So if America is serious about banning harmless products like hemp, just because they are related to drugs, then I have bad news for fans of poppy seed muffins.

This is the third year I have come to the floor during this time—National Hemp History Week—to talk about the importance of industrial hemp, its huge economic potential for hard-working farmers, and the indefensible ban that keeps so many American farmers from growing it. As was the case before, I am joined by Malcolm McGeary from Southern Oregon, where a lot of farmers have an interest in this, to showcase a variety of hemp products in these baskets on the floor because, despite the ban on growing hemp, you can legally import it for use in products sold in stores across the country.

What really changed my mind on this was when my wife was pregnant—we are older parents—with our third child, and we went into a Costco store. We went into a Costco store on a weekend at home in Oregon, and there were these big bags of hemp hearts, and it said: healthy, good for the blood pressure, fiber—everything that one would expect in Pennsylvania or Oregon. I know the Presiding Officer is one of the most physically fit members of the body. I see him in the gym all the time so he obviously cares a lot about nutrition. So Nancy and I were walking through Costco, and it said this giant bag of hemp hearts could be purchased there. You say to yourself: Let me see if I get this straight. The hemp comes from Canada, so the farmers must just be laughing all the way to the bank because they are making money. I get what we do is we put it in bags, and it is sold in Costco. That led me to the really intellectual concept of saying that if you can sell it at a Costco in Oregon, why can't our farmers grow it? It is not much more complicated than that.

When you are shopping for hemp products, it is not just potato sacks and rough fabric by the yard. There is clothing, lotions and food, hemp milk, nutritional supplements—all these products Mr. McGeary has—used to make soaps, cleaners, and even deck stain. I understand Mr. McGeary may even be wearing a hemp tie. None of these products can be called 100 percent American because every bit of the hemp in these baskets had to be grown someplace else, which is essentially what I described as the Wydens toured Costco at home.

When it was imported, it wasn't an American farmer earning money off that sale. Despite the consumer demand for hemp products and the ingenuity of so many producers who find uses for it, American farmers are cut out of the hemp equation.

The ban on hemp is not anti-drug policy. I think that is what has been confusing with respect to this issue. The ban on hemp is not going to advance the cause of being against drugs. It is not anti-drug policy. It is anti-farmer policy, and it is anti-American jobs policy.

As I indicated, if you can buy it in a local supermarket, the American farmer ought to be able to grow it. Yet year after year, despite a lot of work from Members on both sides of the aisle in this body and in the House, hemp remains on the controlled substance list.

Hemp is not a drug. It is a big opportunity for our farmers. So it is long past time to end these statutory relics of history that cut American farmers out of a valuable market.

Despite the fact that hemp continues to be stigmatized by Federal laws, there is some good news and progress. The 2014 farm bill began to chip away at the Federal ban. It OK'd hemp research projects led by universities and agriculture departments in States like Oregon and Kentucky that take a smarter approach to hemp. These projects are showing significant success. Farmers are ready to grow hemp, and States' agriculture departments are ready to regulate.

The first steps, in my view, don't go far enough, and even some of these early projects remain tied up in red-tape due to the Federal ban.

In my view, the only real solution is a legislative solution. So here we have a bipartisan coalition, the kind of coalition you see in the U.S. Senate when people really look into the facts and Members decide to make common cause. We have the good fortune of having the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky, as one of our principal sponsors; Senator PAUL, his colleague; Senator MERKLEY; and I reintroducing the Hemp Farming Act. We pursued this for a number of years. I introduced it every Congress since 2011.

Last year, our bipartisan bill had more than a dozen Senate cosponsors. This year, the goal is to again find common ground to remove hemp from the schedule I controlled substance list, give the go-ahead to farmers across the country who are ready to grow industrial hemp, and, once again, make it a true American crop.

I hope my colleagues will join in the effort to celebrate National Hemp History Week. I hope they will use it to learn more about a very versatile crop, a safe crop, and one with really extraordinary potential to boost jobs in the economy, in our agricultural sector, and our domestic employment base.

This is commonsense legislation. Again, we have the good fortune to be led by the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL. We will be introducing this commonsense legislation very shortly.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017. For too long, a myopic focus on the Iran deal blinded the United States to Iran's persistent campaign to destabilize the Middle East and undermine America's national security interests. Iran has been given a free pass to detain U.S. sailors in clear violation of international law, conduct ballistic missile tests in violation of the United Nations resolutions, support terrorist groups across the region, and prop up the murderous Assad regime in Syria.

It is long past time for the United States and the international community to hold Iran accountable, not just for its commitments under the nuclear deal but for its destabilizing behavior across the Middle East. This legislation begins to do just that by imposing new sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program, applying terrorism sanctions to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, imposing sanctions on Iranians engaged in human rights abuses, and tightening enforcement on arms embargoes on the Iranian regime.

I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senators CORKER and CARDIN, for ringing this bill to the floor. They recognize that the United States must not stand idly by when hostile regimes undermine and attack our interests and that of our allies. They recognize that regimes that aid and abet crimes against humanity must be held accountable. They recognize that weakness in the face of aggression is provocative.

These are the reasons we must pass this legislation, but these are also the very same reasons this legislation must be amended to strengthen and expand sanctions against Vladimir Putin's Russia.

In just the last 3 years under Vladimir Putin, Russia has invaded Ukraine, annexed Crimea, threatened NATO allies, and intervened militarily in Syria,

leaving a trail of death, destruction, and broken promises in its wake.

Last year, Russia attacked the foundations of American democracy with a cyber and information campaign to interfere in America's 2016 election. It has been 8 months now since the U.S. intelligence community publicly concluded that the Russian Government had attempted to interfere in our last Presidential election.

On October 7, 2016, the Department of Homeland Security and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence stated that the ''U.S. intelligence community is confident that the Russian government directed the recent compromises of e-mails from U.S. persons and institutions, including from U.S. political organizations.'' The statement concluded that ''only Russia's senior-most officials could have authorized these activities.''

On January 6, 2017, the U.S. intelligence community went even further, concluding:

> Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the United States presidential election. Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the United States democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency.

The intelligence community ''did not make an assessment of the impact that Russian activities had on the outcome of the 2016 election,'' but they did warn that ''Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. Presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes.''

Since January, months of congressional hearings, testimony, and investigative work have reinforced these conclusions: that Russia deliberately interfered in our recent election with cyber attacks and a disinformation campaign designed to weaken America and undermine faith in our democracy and our values.

Vladimir Putin's brazen attack on our democracy is a flagrant demonstration of his disdain and disrespect for our Nation. This should not just outrage every American, it should compel us to action. But in the last 8 months, what price has Russia paid for attacking American democracy? Hardly any at all: modest sanctions against a few Russian individuals and entities, some Russian diplomats and spies sent home to Russia, two spy compounds have closed, at least for now—and all of this reversible and at the discretion of the President.

What has Russia's reaction been to America's tepid response and reaction to its aggressive behavior? More of the same. More aggression, more meddling. Russia attempted to overthrow the democratically elected Government of Montenegro and murder its Prime Minister. Russia attempted to interfere in France's election. We have already seen attempts to influence German public opinion ahead of the elections in September, and there is every expectation that Russia will do the same thing in the Czech Republic, Italy, and elsewhere in future elections.

Sooner or later, my friends, there will be another American election that captures Russian attention and interest. The victim may be a Republican or a Democrat. To Putin, it won't matter because his targets are not Republicans or Democrats but Americans and all that we stand for as a people. He seeks to sow dissent amongst us and divide us from one another, to erode our resolve to resist his dark and dangerous view of the world, and to undermine our confidence in ourselves and our belief in our own values.

We must take our own side in this fight—not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. It is time to respond to Russia's attack on American democracy with strength and resolve, with common purpose, and with action. Together with Senator GRAHAM and a number of other Senators, I am prepared to offer an amendment to this legislation that will begin to do just that. It incorporates some of the best ideas from different pieces of legislation already introduced in the Senate, ideas that have broad bipartisan support.

The amendment we are talking about would impose mandatory sanctions on transactions with the Russian defense or intelligence sectors, including the FSB and the GRU, the Russian military intelligence agency that was primarily responsible for Russia's attack on our election.

The amendment would impose mandatory visa bans and asset freezes on any individual who undermines the cyber security of public or private infrastructure and democratic institutions. It would impose mandatory sanctions on those who assist or support such activities.

The amendment would codify existing sanctions on Russia by placing into law five Executive orders signed by President Obama in response to both Russian interference in the 2016 election and its illegal actions in Ukraine, and it would take new steps to tighten those sanctions. For example, Russia's ability to issue new sovereign debt essentially allows Russia to borrow money from global capital markets to offset pressure from existing U.S. and European sanctions. So this amendment would impose mandatory sanctions on U.S. and third-party investment in sales of Russian sovereign debt as well as in the privatization of Russian state-owned assets.

The amendment would target the Russian energy sector, which is controlled by Vladimir Putin's cronies, with sanctions on investments in Russian petroleum and natural gas development as well as Russian energy pipelines.

We also need to put additional pressure on the ability of Putin and his cronies to move money they have looted from the Russian state. So this amendment would mandate that the Secretary of the Treasury establish a high-level task force within the Department's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network that would focus on tracing, mapping, and prosecuting illicit financial flows linked to Russia if such flows interact with the U.S. financial system. The task force would also work with liaison officers in key U.S. Embassies, especially in Europe, to work with local authorities to uncover and prosecute the networks responsible for the illicit Russian financial flows.

Finally, recognizing that Russia seeks to undermine not just American democracy but Western democracy altogether, this amendment would provide support to the State Department, the Global Engagement Center, and USAID to help build the resilience of democratic institutions in Europe against Russian aggression exerted through corruption, propaganda, and other forms of political interference.

We need a strong Russia sanctions amendment. We need it now. We need it on this piece of legislation. We need this amendment because we have no time to waste. The United States of America needs to send a strong message to Vladimir Putin and any other aggressor that we will not tolerate attacks on our democracy. There is no greater threat to our freedoms than attacks on our ability to choose our own leaders free from foreign interference. So we must act accordingly, and we must act now.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, this body has a dual obligation—to ensure that there are sanctions against Iran for its destabilizing activity around the region and, indeed, the world but also sanctions against Russia for its interference with our election—one of the core democratic institutions of our Nation—as well as other acts that are hostile to the world order and to world peace.

I support S. 722, the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act, but I strongly believe it should have Russian sanctions included as well.

As the Senate proceeds to this urgently needed measure, Iran's own Parliament has suffered an ISIS-claimed terrorist attack in Tehran. I condemn that act of terror—one of many the world has suffered because of ISIS. We are at war with ISIS as we are with terrorists—extremism—around the world. It intentionally targets civilians. It uses violence to spread terror and destabilize the Middle East. ISIS has been a world terror organization.

The fact that Iran's leaders themselves direct and glorify terrorism against Israel and the United States does not diminish the horror of what has occurred. People of all faiths from an increasingly diverse number of nations have become victims of this terror spread by ISIS and Iran. What occurred today is, sadly, more evidence that Iran's unconditional support for Bashar al-Assad is directly counter to the interests of the Iranian people and our ongoing efforts to defeat ISIS.

We must hold Iran accountable. We must hold it accountable for its many malign activities through increasing and enforcing strong, targeted sanctions. I thank my colleagues, including Senator MCCAIN, who just spoke so forcefully on the floor, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator CORKER, Senator CARDIN, as well as other colleagues who have worked on this cause. We must hold Iran accountable for the threat its acts of terrorism pose to our national security. We must hold it accountable to the threat its missile program holds to our allies, including Israel—our major strategic partner in that region. We must hold Iran accountable for the gross violations of human rights and war crimes that it and Russia together are perpetrating in Syria.

In the last few months, Iran has tested and fired ballistic missiles, tested a new Russian-made air defense system against missiles, and harassed U.S. ships. It continues to arm and enable the Hamas terrorist organization, the despotic Assad regime, and the supply of weapons to Hezbollah. It has enabled Hezbollah to amass 150,000 rockets and missiles—all aimed at civilians in Israel.

Last month, the State Department released a report on Iran's human rights violations. It continues to show a troubling trend of abuse and notes that Iran has more than 800 political prisoners and that it executed at least 469 people just last year.

We know that sanctions must be targeted and continually strengthened to deter Iran. This legislation will impose sanctions on Iran for its support of terrorism, human rights violations, and ballistic missile development. That includes sanctioning any person who knowingly violates arms embargoes or materially contributes to Iran's ballistic missile program. It also includes terrorism-related sanctions on members of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and its affiliates—going beyond members of the Quds Force, who are already sanctioned.

In no way does this sanctions program contradict or undermine the nuclear agreement with Iran. That agreement provided us and our allies the time and space to now push Iran to end its malign activities without the imminent threat of a nuclear weapon.

Congress must do everything it can to authorize new measures against Iran and ensure that this new administration effectively enforces them. We must also seize this opportunity to hold Russia accountable as well for its egregious, aggressive behavior and ongoing violations of international law.

Russia's cooperation with Iran, including providing Iran with an S–300 air missile defense system that it recently tested, strengthens Iran as it fuels and finances a network of terrorism. Under Putin's direction, Russia both enabled and tried to cover up crimes in Syria. It invaded Ukraine. It illegally annexed Crimea. It attacked and interfered with our democracy.

Enough is enough. That is why I urge this body to adopt Russian sanctions as part of S. 722. Sadly and dangerously, our President has proven time and again to be unwilling to hold Vladimir Putin accountable. Congress must ensure that he does so. It must ensure that Russia receives a clear, unequivocal signal through this measure, Senator CARDIN's Counteracting Russian Hostilities Act, and Senator GRAHAM's Russia Sanctions Review Act, as an amendment to be adopted by this body to the Iran legislation, which I helped author. These measures are critical to sending a message that we will hold Russia accountable for its lawbreaking, its support of terrorism, its interference in our elections, its annexation of Crimea, its invasion of Ukraine, and its violation of the INF Treaty. I can accept nothing short of including these Russia bills to move forward to a final vote. I will support S. 722, but I believe there is a track and a path for this body to do both, and we must do it.

The imposition of mandatory sanctions codifying former President Obama's Executive orders regarding Ukraine and malicious cyber activity, as well as targeting individuals and entities contributing to Russia's oil and gas industries, should be part of this final passage. We cannot afford to wait any longer to take action.

I am disappointed that the President has seemed disinterested or at least unwilling to join in these sanctions against Russia. Unfortunately, the testimony that former Director Jim Comey will deliver tomorrow provides evidence as to possible motive and intent in his discussions with Comey that reflect on his apparent willingness to tolerate this aggressive conduct by Russia without holding it accountable.

This testimony from Director Comey is an explosive corroboration of the facts that have been reported—that the President asked for loyalty, threatening Jim Comey's job, and tried to influence the FBI's ongoing criminal investigation on multiple occasions. This conduct shows unequivocally the disdain the President has for the rule of law and clearly demonstrates that he believes he and his friends and family are above the law. I am saddened and I am chilled that this harrowing account will be given to the Senate Intelligence Committee rather than, in fact, in a fictional spy novel.

Director Comey deserves credit for his willingness to come before the committee, for his apparent candor and truthfulness, and for his resistance to those demands for a pledge of loyalty and an end to the Flynn investigation, even when it meant his firing.

His testimony should serve as evidence in the investigation led by Robert Mueller but also as evidence that Mr. Mueller must have unimpeded space, resources, and independence to conduct his investigation. I will take action as a member of the Judiciary Committee to seek oversight simply to ensure that those resources are independent and are safeguarded. With this documented proof, clearly the White House has sought to derail our law enforcement officials in their enforcing of the law. We must ensure an end to such conduct, and we must send Russia a signal that, in fact, it will be held accountable; that the investigation into its meddling in our election will be pursued vigorously and aggressively; that anyone in this country who colluded with or aided and abetted that meddling will be held accountable; and that there will be no obstruction of justice. This goal should unite us across the aisle on a bipartisan basis.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I voted no today on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 722, the Iran sanctions bill.

I did so not because I oppose the underlying bill and the need to further sanction Iran's belligerent missile and terrorist activity; in fact, I support that legislation. I voted no to give a moment's pause after the terrible ISIS attack in Tehran that just occurred.

Earlier today, a pair of deadly attacks occurred over several hours in Tehran, including in the nation's parliament building, indiscriminately killing at least 12 people and wounding dozens more. The heavily armed assailants targeted guards, cleaners, and administrative employees of the parliament. ISIS later claimed responsibility for this barbaric attack.

I certainly have my differences with the Iranian regime, its continued sponsorship of Hezbollah and Hamas, its threats to Israel, its proxy wars in Yemen and Syria, and its human rights abuses, but we must remember that the Iranian regime isn't the same as the Iranian people, many of whom expressed sympathy with the American people after we suffered the horrific attack on September 11.

In fact, the Iranian Government issued a surprisingly strong statement of condemnation of the terrorists responsible after the September 11 attack.

There was even some hope after those statements that our two nations might work together on other shared interests, although unfortunately, other than the historic nuclear agreement, that has not come to pass.

Nevertheless, I think it is important that we pause and reaffirm the statement made today by our State Department that condemns the attack in Iran

and expresses condolences for the families and victims.

I also think it is critical that we finally take some action here in the Congress to address Russia's attack on our election, which occurred more than 7 months ago.

We have overwhelming evidence of this historic attack—an attack that I liken to a cyber act of war.

The majority party here in Congress has done nothing to respond to Russia's aggression or to help protect America against any future such attack on our democracy.

President Trump still refuses to acknowledge the Russian attack—seemingly more interested in befriending the Russians and complaining about former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Comey than convincingly telling Russia to never interfere in our election again or face the consequences.

This lack of resolve is truly an abdication of our national security responsibilities in Congress.

As one Polish security expert recently warned me, if the United States does not respond to the Russia attack on its own democracy, then Putin will feel emboldened and free to conduct further such attacks against other Western democracies.

Sadly, that has already proven true—just look at Russia's meddling in the recent French, German, and Dutch elections.

As we act to address Iran's troubling missile and destabilizing activity in the Middle East, including its continued threat against Israel, we must also act against Russia, which conducted a cyber act of war against our Nation.

We must ensure that existing sanctions placed on Russia for its destabilizing actions in Ukraine and Europe and its attack on our election are not lifted until such Russian actions are reversed or addressed.

I voted no on cloture today—out of respect for the Iranian people who suffered the horrific attack today and because I think it is long overdue for the Congress to finally respond to Russia's attack on our Nation—and stand prepared to support the final Iran sanctions bill after addressing these matters.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Donald Trump has decided to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement on climate change. This is a decision that may prove to be one of the worst foreign policy blunders in our Nation's history.

There is no denying the mounting threat of climate change. We observe rising seas, warming global temperatures, and melting glaciers and ice sheets. Yet the President cast aside a historic global agreement forged through American leadership.

Americans now ask what to do next. For individual citizens, my answer is simple: Take action. Join an environmental group. Support science and scientists. Organize in your community.

Many Americans have been publicly pledging to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement through movements like the ''I am still in'' pledge. Every action, big and small, counts.

American corporations must also act. Unfortunately, they have been AWOL in the politics of climate change. This has been so frustrating because so many of them have great climate principles. They just abandon them when they come to Washington. That is why, for my 169th ''Time to Wake Up'' speech, I have a message for corporate America:

First, know that you are hugely influential in Congress. You command extraordinary attention in our political system. This gives you a unique power against the Breitbart fake-news spigot, the shameless fossil fuel industry, and the Koch brothers' climate denial operation, which were all behind the President's fateful decision.

President Trump's brain-dead withdrawal from the Paris accord may prove to be for the best if it creates heightened political interest in climate action from American business leaders. At the moment, corporate political interests in climate action, setting the fossil fuel industry aside entirely, still averages out below zero.

As a Senator, I see corporate America's lobbying efforts in Congress firsthand. Here are some highlights:

Silicon Valley lobbies through an organization called TechNet. TechNet represents Goliaths, like Microsoft, Apple, Google, and Facebook, all of which have great climate policies. TechNet also represents clean energy companies, like Sunrun, Bloom Energy, and SolarCity.

TechNet came again this year to lobby Congress on its six priorities. Here is a page from the actual lobbying materials that TechNet brought to our meeting. The group's Federal policies are these: tax reform, high-skilled immigration reform, education and workforce development, entrepreneurship and job creation, smart infrastructure, and digital trade. Climate change did not make it onto TechNet's priorities list. Even clean energy failed to make it onto the list of the organization that includes Bloom Energy, SolarCity, and Sunrun.

This is not a matter of these giants being cowed by the Trump administration. TechNet came last year when Obama was President, and climate change was not on their agenda then, either. Indeed, the week TechNet came last year, I also had a visit from the timber and lumber industry. Despite what climate change is doing to America's forests, climate change was not on the lumber and timber industry agenda.

That very same week, the property casualty insurance industry came to meet me. These insurance companies write the big checks when climate change sends Mother Nature haywire. Climate change was not mentioned by this industry, either. That was quite a week.

Big business lobbying on climate change is actually worse than zero because the big business trade associations and lobbying groups are often run by the fossil fuel industry. Green energy manufacturers, represented in Washington, DC, by the National Association of Manufacturers, will find their own association lined up against them on climate change. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is one of climate action's most implacable enemies, despite the good climate policies of so many companies on its board.

These lobby groups are the most persistent voices of America's business community here in Congress. They are the ones who are most active, and they are constant enemies on clean energy and climate action—despite the companies they represent—because, in truth, they answer to the fossil fuel industry, not the business community, when it comes to climate change.

Here is how this can play out. Coca-Cola and PepsiCo are the two biggest beverage companies in America. Both have excellent climate policies. Pepsi even supports Ceres, a fledgling business lobbying group for climate action, but their trade association, the American Beverage Association, takes no lobbying interest in climate change. It knows how to lobby. We can see the lobbying expenditures run up in 2009 and 2010, when they were concerned about Congress's taxing sweetened drinks or corn syrup. It just takes no interest in climate issues.

Worse, Coke and Pepsi run money through the American Beverage Association to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Add their lobbying all up, and Coke and Pepsi do virtually nothing themselves. A few ounces of credit go to Pepsi for supporting Ceres. Their American Beverage Association trade group doesn't lift a finger to help, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is a brute force adversary.

The result is that the net lobbying presence of Coke and Pepsi in Congress on climate change is exactly opposed to the two companies' stated policies on climate change. They say one thing; their lobbying effort does the opposite.

On the other side of the fossil fuel divide, the heavy political hand of the fossil fuel industry is felt constantly around here, and that heavy hand is mercilessly opposed to any climate action and enforces its will with a parade of political weaponry akin to those old Soviet May Day parades of tanks, rockets, and artillery. Cross them, and they

come after you hard. Ask former Congressman Bob Inglis. He urged his fellow Republicans to heed the climate science and was hammered for it.

Also, no one should buy the phony assertions by Big Oil CEOs that they recognize that climate change is real and support putting a price on carbon. They say that. ExxonMobil's CEO said that to his shareholders again just last week.

In the Senate, I am the Senate author of a carbon price bill. I know who is lobbying where on carbon prices, and I can tell you their statement is just not true. Every single element of that Soviet May Day parade of fossil fuel political weaponry is dead set against any such thing. What do we conclude from that? Either Big Oil's CEOs don't know what their own lobbying apparatus is doing, or they are just not telling the truth. You guess which.

The strategy of the fossil fuel industry has been to control the Republican Party. You can jam things up by jamming up one party, and you can make it look like it is a partisan issue when it is just old-fashioned, self-interested lobbying. In order to accomplish that purpose, the worst of the political threats and blandishments of the fossil fuel industry are directed against Republicans.

As long as legitimate corporate leaders in America sit idly by while fossil fuel terrorizes and corrupts the Republican Party, there will not be much progress. ''But, oh,'' some will say, ''there aren't Republicans who will respond. This is too partisan an issue. It will be a wasted effort.'' Not so. I came to the Senate in 2007, and for years there was bipartisan action on climate change—2007, 2008, 2009.

It only stopped when the fossil fuel industry secured from five Republican-appointed Justices on the Supreme Court the disgraceful Citizens United decision of 2010. In 2007, lots of bipartisan activity; 2008, lots of bipartisan activity; 2009, lots of bipartisan activity; 2010, Citizens United—dead stop. That Citizens United decision is what started the fossil fuel Soviet May Day parade of unprecedented political artillery. No special interest had that kind of political artillery before Citizens United opened it up, and much of the post-Citizens United effort has been using dark money to hide the fossil fuel industry's hand.

Since Citizens United, there has been no bipartisan climate action, but that doesn't mean there aren't still Republicans willing to work with us. I know this firsthand. There are Republicans willing to work with us. They just need to know somebody will give them safe passage through the political kill zone that Citizens United has let the fossil fuel industry create. Well, with the Trump administration now all the way over in the ''fossil fuel, Breitbart, Koch brothers climate denial corner,'' it now rests on the shoulders of the legitimate business community to come off the sidelines. They can't count on this administration. They now have to come off the sidelines themselves and do so in strength commensurate with the seriousness of the problem.

If, as a country, we pitch ourselves and the world into the present worst-case climate change scenarios, billions of people will suffer, and suffering people want answers and justice. It will become hard to defend to them our American system of democratic government against charges of corruption and our system of market capitalism against charges of indifference. Government has been corrupted by fossil fuel interests, and too many companies are indifferent. You can't make a case without the facts to back it up, and American companies, more than anyone else, benefit from a world order where liberal democracies prevail. So the stakes for the American business community are very real.

The political mischief of the fossil fuel industry and its front groups will leave a lasting stain on the democracy we all treasure. It is time, in the wake of the President's decision on Paris—isolating America with Syria as our companion in isolation—it is time that the decent and honorable business community played a meaningful role in setting this right. To them, I say: Trump has betrayed you so now is the time to align your industry's political engagement with your industry's position on climate. That is not asking much. We are only asking that American corporations align their political engagement on climate change with their actual position on climate change. If you take climate change seriously, great. Take it seriously when you come to Congress. The United States of America, where 1 day after D-day—a day when Americans stormed ashore to free the continent of Europe, fought their way through to knock down Nazi tyranny, and then rebuilt Europe under the Marshall Plan and came home—that country ought not to be a pariah nation with Syria.

We needn't be a banana republic for fossil fuel. We can lead the world into a brighter, cleaner, safer energy future, but it will take an effort. So, corporate America, let's make the effort.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, it is nice to see the Presiding Officer in the Chair. Because he is a student of history, I know it will come as no surprise to my colleague from Colorado that this week marks the 70th anniversary of the Marshall Plan.

In 1947, Europe was in ruins. After years of war, factories from Manchester to Munich had been bombed out. Railroads laid disfigured from artillery. Farms stood defaced by the tracks of a thousand tanks. Across the continent, Europe's once humming economies stood silent. Over 60 million people had died, including 6 million Jews who were killed in the Holocaust.

Here in the United States, we mourned the loss of over 400,000 of our soldiers. We had spent, in today's dollars, nearly $4 trillion to secure that victory in World War II. But to secure the peace, our leaders understood that even more was required of us. Truman's Secretary of State, George Marshall, told the Nation that without a return to ''normal economic health in the world,'' there could be ''no assured peace.'' In other words, if famine and poverty remained unchecked across Europe, unanswered, fascism and communism would soon follow, threatening U.S. interests and global stability at the same time.

So after years of sacrifice—sacrifice that this generation of Americans, thank goodness, has never had to endure—the easy course would have been to withdraw behind the Atlantic and the Pacific, turn our back on the world, and embrace isolation.

Instead, we proposed the Marshall Plan, a bold investment to revive Europe's economies, modernize industry, and expand trade, not only for allies like France and Britain but also for our enemies, Germany and Italy. It was extraordinary that political leaders here once made those decisions. I struggle to think of a time in human history when the victor helped to revive the vanquished with no strings attached, no colonial objective.

As the Marshall Plan made its way through Congress, leaders in Washington made the case to the American people, even standing firm against some who wanted to require European countries to buy only American products with the aid that we gave them. Still in the years to come, American farmers and manufacturers would fill millions of crates of wheat and wood, of sugar and steel to rebuild Europe from the ravages of war.

President Truman understood that, in time, strong European economies would become strong trading partners, strong military allies, and a bulwark of freedom against Soviet expansion. History proved him right, to say the least.

After the Marshall Plan, Western Europe surged back to life as Eastern Europe stagnated behind the Iron Curtain. In the West, production rose and hunger fell. Foes became friends. Bonds across the Atlantic solidified. Investments through the Marshall Plan helped lay the foundation for NATO, the common market, and the European Union.

Few actions in our foreign policy have been as consequential for America's long-term interests, for our national interests, and all at a cost of $150 billion in today's dollars—25 times less than the total cost of World War II

and about 25 times less than what we paid in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

As President Truman invested in Europe's recovery, he also helped fashion a new world order from the rubble of war. American leadership forged global institutions to enshrine our interests and values around the world for generations, giving rise to the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations, and the entire international system that we have today.

Seventy years ago, President Truman had the vision to think longer term. He had the wisdom to see that what was good for others was often good for us as well. And he had the courage to ask our citizens to lead, to sacrifice, and to believe that even after the second war in a generation, it was still within their power to shape a lasting peace.

Those actions, those qualities are why Truman's Presidency marks one of the finest periods in American foreign policy in the history of our foreign policy. The comparison with what we are seeing today just couldn't be starker.

Under the banner of putting America first, President Trump has undermined our interests at nearly every turn. At a time when China proposes to spend over a trillion dollars to expand its global influence with new railroads from Hungary to Kenya, new bridges and tunnels linking Southeast Asia together, and new electrical plants to power Pakistan, President Trump proposes to slash our foreign assistance advancing U.S. interests around the world. At a time when NATO faces challenges to its east and south, President Trump publicly rebukes the alliance and refuses to reinforce its bedrock principle of collective security.

As the recent terrorist attack unfolded in London, President Trump took to Twitter to promote his political agenda and sow fear in the wake of that attack. In the face of challenges like extremism and instability that demand 40-year strategies like the ones President Truman had in mind, President Trump is conducting his foreign policy 140 characters at a time.

Now, as the world unites to confront the perils of climate change, our President has withdrawn from the landmark Paris Agreement, which we helped forge, in a shameful abdication of America's global leadership. In doing so, the President ignored the voices of millions of Americans and thousands of businesses, urging him—against the arguments that he made—to stay in the agreement for climate reasons, for economic reasons, and for national security reasons as well. By withdrawing from it, the President has turned his back on millions of people across the globe, as well, mostly the poor, who are already on the edge of crisis, who may face drought, displacement, and famine from a warming planet.

America has a strong interest in avoiding that future. Anybody who has seen what has happened since the Arab Spring understands what resulted from a doubling of the price of wheat in Egypt. A wise leader could see that. A President Truman would see that.

Like the Marshall Plan, the Paris Agreement recognized that in the modern world there is no ''over there'' anymore. Today, over there is here, and here is over there, and our President fundamentally doesn't understand it.

He claimed that withdrawing from the Paris Agreement would ''put America first.'' In fact, this move threatens to put America last—last in innovation, last in clean energy, last in science, last in our moral responsibility to hand the next generation a safe and stable planet. That is why States and cities all across the country are making their own commitments to honor the Paris Agreement.

Now it is just us, Nicaragua, and Syria on the other side. That is why towns, cities, and States all across the country are scrambling to fill the void of leadership left by the administration to show the rest of the world that we are serious too.

In my home State of Colorado, we know that we can protect our economy and our climate, that we can grow our economy and protect our climate. We see those as linked together. You can't do one without the other. We developed the first State limits on methane pollution. We passed the first voter-led renewable standard in the entire Nation. We established our own limits on carbon pollution. And in the process, we have created 13,000 renewable energy jobs, with wind jobs alone expected to triple by 2020. On average, those jobs pay a salary of $50,000. We are manufacturing again in our State with the supply chains that come along with it.

What comes with those commonsense regulations? One of the strongest economies in America, the lowest unemployment rate in America, and we see this all across the country. New energy jobs are growing 12 times faster than the overall economy. The President doesn't see any of that.

In a matter of months, from foreign assistance, to global alliances, to terrorism and climate change, the administration has imperiled America's stature with a shortsighted and willfully ignorant agenda that is profoundly out of step with the realities of the world and the interests of the people of the United States.

In a recent op-ed, senior officials from the administration painted the world as no more than an ''arena'' where nations ''compete for advantage.'' They were trying to explain the President's behavior while he was in Europe. That attitude marks a huge departure from generations of American foreign policy. This is not about the Obama administration; this is about a set of traditional American values and approaches to the world that we have had almost since the Nation's founding, and the space the President is creating out there in the world by abandoning those treasured American values gives space to those who seek every single day to undermine the liberal world order that has allowed our country and allies across the globe to succeed.

The President should understand that generations of leaders in the United States have put America first. They have always put America first—not in slogans or stump speeches but in the alliances and institutions we built, the values we champion, the alliances we forged that have given our world 70 years of peace and prosperity. That is a legacy upon which we must build—one that has put America first and has kept America first today and, if we act wisely, I think for decades to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Kansas.

(The remarks of Mr. MORAN are printed in today's RECORD during consideration of S. Res. 174.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

HEALTHCARE REFORM

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the destructive path that the majority is headed down with their attempts to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Republican bill, and, frankly, the House Republican bill that the Senate is now considering in addition to other ideas is, in my judgment, not really a healthcare bill but a tax cut bill. It is a tax cut bill for the super-rich—not only the rich but, literally, the wealthiest few Americans—while increasing costs for middle-class families. It gives States the option to allow insurance companies to discriminate again like they did before the ACA was passed. It would also allow those same policies to devastate our hospitals, particularly those in rural communities. I live in a State where 48 out of 67 counties are, in fact, rural counties.

The Republican bill would rip away healthcare, according to the Congressional Budget Office, from 23 million Americans. Here is what that means in Pennsylvania, based upon the Congressional Budget Office numbers: Up to 770,000 Pennsylvanians could lose health insurance by 2026 if the bill were to pass, 48,000 Pennsylvania seniors on Medicare could lose access to services covered by Medicaid, and 52,600 Pennsylvanians with disabilities could lose Medicaid coverage. I live in a State

where, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, over 722,000 Pennsylvanians with disabilities rely on Medical Assistance for their medical care. Medical Assistance is the State version of Medicaid. We know that if you are a child, if you are a senior, or if you have a disability, many Americans in those categories, of course, rely upon Medicaid.

We also know, based upon the CBO numbers, that 180,000 Pennsylvanians could lose access to mental health and substance abuse care now provided by Medicaid. We have heard a lot of talk, and there has been a lot of work, actually, in this body, as well as in the other body, in the last year on the opioid problem. We have Democrats and Republicans focusing on a major national problem, an urgent public health problem. We have made some progress—not enough but some good progress—on opioid legislation. All of that would be badly undermined if we made the changes to Medicaid that some want to make here because of the significant impact that cuts to Medicaid would have on the challenge of reducing the opioid crisis.

So even the possibility that this bill might become law is, in a sense, destabilizing to the healthcare marketplace, which has been better each year we move forward from the passage of the ACA in 2010.

Just last week, the Pennsylvania Insurance Department announced average proposed rate increases for health insurance premiums for 2018. Here is what the Pennsylvania Insurance Department told us. If we maintain current law, premiums will go up 8.8 percent in Pennsylvania. If the Republicans get rid of the cost-sharing subsidies, which many seem either to want to get rid of or to want to ignore, thereby creating uncertainty—if those cost-sharing subsidies are thrown out the window—premiums will go up 2.5 times as much, by over 20 percent. So far, it is 8.8 percent under current law or 20 percent just based upon the cost-sharing subsidies being taken away.

Also, if the individual mandate is repealed, premiums will go up almost three times as much, by 23 percent. If we get rid of both the cost-sharing subsidies and the individual mandate, premiums in our State will go up by over 36 percent.

So we have a basic choice to make, at least as it relates to Pennsylvania. Under current law, it is 8.8 percent, and we should try to bring that down. I think there are ways we could work together in a bipartisan fashion to bring that down. But if we go in the direction that many want to go—especially on the Republican side—to undermine or to do nothing about cost-sharing and get to rid of the individual mandate, premiums go up 36 percent. So folks can make their choice to go up about 9 percent or to go up 36 percent. It is a real simple choice with basically two options.

The bill that was passed in the House would destroy the lives of many vulnerable Pennsylvanians. What should we do about it? Well, the first thing we should do with the bill is to throw it in the trash heap. That is where it belongs, and I hope that is where Senate Republicans are headed and that they are going to start over on a new bill, because the bill that was passed in the House is very bad for the country.

Among the 3 million Pennsylvanians with preexisting conditions are two remarkable young women whose mother first contacted me in 2009. Stacie Ritter, from Manheim, PA, is the mom of four children, including her twin daughters, Hannah and Madeline, who are depicted here in this picture when they were much younger. Hannah and Madeline were diagnosed with a rare and dangerous type of leukemia when they were just 4 years old. You can see their picture there at that time.

Stacy and her husband Benjamin went bankrupt trying to pay their daughters' medical bills. She wrote to me at the time, saying that without healthcare reform, ''my girls will be unable to afford care, that is if they are eligible, for care that is critically necessary to maintain this chronic condition.''

Fortunately, things have changed in the last 8 or so years. Fortunately, Hannah and Madeline are healthy young women now. They are freshman at Arcadia University and are doing well. They rely on the Affordable Care Act's protections to ensure that they have access to affordable coverage, whether they are on their parents' plan or purchasing a plan in the individual market. As you can see on my left, this is a picture of Hannah and Madeline today as college freshmen.

Without the Affordable Care Act, Hannah and Madeline could be denied health insurance. As their mom said, they could be ''punished and rejected because they had the misfortune of developing cancer as a child.''

The Republican bill passed in the House would put them at risk of being denied health insurance or being charged more because they are cancer survivors.

I don't know why anyone would support a bill that would do that.

Just a number of months ago I received a letter from Pam Simpson from Chester County, PA. Pam and her son Rowan have their story to tell. Rowan is 5 years old, and a number of years ago he was diagnosed with autism. I have talked about Rowan before on this floor and in other places and what Medicaid means for Rowan and his family. Medicaid provides important services for Rowan and others with disabilities, enabling Rowan to go to preschool and allowing his mother to work. Here is what his mom said to me. I won't read the whole letter, but I will just highlight the first page.

The first page is Rowan's life before he was diagnosed with autism—all of the challenges that he and his family had—and Rowan's life after the diagnosis of autism, but, then, ultimately, when he received Medicaid, or Medical Assistance, as we call it in Pennsylvania. Here is what his mom told me in the letter after he received word that he was going to be enrolled in Medical Assistance:

> Late January 2016, I applied for Medicaid.

That is Medical Assistance.

> After Rowan was awarded Medical Assistance, we were able to obtain wrap-around services. These services included a Behavioral Specialist Consultant and a Therapeutic Staff Support worker.

She goes on later in that paragraph to say that these wrap-around services ''have been a Godsend.''

Then she goes on later and says:

> I am thrilled by Rowan's daily progress. I cannot say enough good things about this program.

Then she says:

> Without Medical Assistance, I am confident that I could not work full time to support our family. Our family would be bankrupt or my son would go without the therapies he sincerely needs.

Here is the last line of her letter:

> We are desperately in need of Rowan's Medical Assistance and would be devastated if we lost these benefits.

She is referencing ''Medical Assistance'' for Medicaid, the same program at the State level.

So we have two families now that are totally reliant on these programs, either the ACA more broadly or, in particular, the Medicaid Program. Both families have referenced bankruptcy because of healthcare challenges in the life of that family—one who would be on the brink of bankruptcy, Rowan's family, and the other, who actually went through bankruptcy because of those healthcare challenges. No family in the United States of America should have to worry about going bankrupt because of a healthcare problem. We are well on our way to solving these problems, and no one should pull the rug out from under those families. But, unfortunately, when it comes to this legislation, that is exactly what could happen to many of them.

I will give a third example: Alex. Recently I met Alex, who is from Southeastern Pennsylvania. He is 9 years old, and he has Down syndrome. Here is what Alex, a 9-year-old, wrote:

> Although I have a medical diagnosis of Down Syndrome, I am an excellent student. I get 100 percent on my spelling tests and I get picked as the Math King quite often. . . . My parents, my teachers, and everyone around me thought from the beginning there was nothing that I could not do. . . . I am able to get a good education because of the supports that I get from Special Education. That's why I am very concerned about the possible cuts in Medicaid funding in schools. . . . Medicaid funding in schools is a very, very important part of what makes it possible for us to receive successful education in school and become contributing members of our society.

That is a 9-year-old in Pennsylvania reminding us about this important program. Alex has tremendous potential that would be in jeopardy by the proposed cuts to Medicaid.

Here is another example: Peg Fagan of Pennsylvania. The Republican bill includes an age tax that will allow insurers to charge older Americans up to five times more than younger Americans. Peg is from Bucks County, in Southeastern Pennsylvania. She is a three-time cancer survivor who could not afford health insurance prior to the Affordable Care Act. She is approaching Medicare eligibility but still has a few years to go before she is old enough to enroll.

Peg was able to find affordable health insurance thanks to the ACA, but under the Republican bill, she could once again be discriminated against for being an older adult, and another possible object of discrimination would be that she is a cancer survivor.

That was the old law. That is where we were before, where insurance companies were allowed under the law to discriminate in that fashion. They could discriminate against you because you were a woman. They could discriminate against you because you had a preexisting condition. They could discriminate against you because you were a cancer survivor or because of your age, or so many other circumstances. I thought we were beyond that. I thought we had finally cured that problem, but some want to go back in time.

So the CBO tells us that the Republican bill would rip away healthcare from 23 million Americans. I just went through some Pennsylvania stories. We have a lot more, and my colleagues will be hearing them. But for Hannah and Madeline and Rowan and Alex and Peg, we should ask ourselves a couple of basic questions. Healthcare for those Pennsylvanians should not be made worse, and they should not be made worse off, in order to give the top one-tenth of 1 percent a $200,000 giveaway. That is what the first version of the House healthcare bill would do. It would give the top one-tenth of 1 percent an average tax cut of $197,000. I exaggerated; I said $200,000. Let's be exact. It is $197,000 each. Why would we take away healthcare or even risk or create uncertainty about healthcare for Hannah, Madeline, Rowan, Alex, and Peg because some people around here want to give tax cuts to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars to very wealthy people? That is not what I call a healthcare bill.

The Senate has an obligation, in my judgment—both parties—to stop this bill from being enacted into law. We cannot allow this legislation to pass or anything like it to become law. So I ask each Member of the Senate to consider these Pennsylvanians and plenty in your home States and the countless more like them who are anxiously hoping and praying this Congress will not vote to take away their healthcare.

DRUG AND VETERANS TREATMENT COURTS

Mr. President, I rise to express my support for the drug and other treatment courts, including veterans treatment courts, in Pennsylvania and the more than 3,000 across the Nation.

Just last month during National Drug Court Month, drug courts across the country held graduation ceremonies to recognize individuals who completed this rigorous treatment program. These courts, which serve about 150,000 people a year, hold offenders with substance use and mental health disorders accountable for their actions through strict supervision while also connecting them to the treatment they need. More than 1.25 million people have successfully graduated from drug and treatment court programs and are now on a path to recovery.

Research has demonstrated that drug and other treatment courts not only reduce crime but also reduce spending by slowing the cycle of recidivism. Drug and other treatment courts are also an important resource to law enforcement and community stakeholders working to combat the opioid epidemic. Opioid addiction is a growing public health crisis in Pennsylvania and throughout the Nation, and it demands real action. As public officials, we have an obligation to ensure that the resources and policies are in place to fight this scourge so that more families won't have to endure the heartache of losing a loved one to addiction.

Veterans treatment courts are innovative and collaborative programs to address some of the unique challenges that face our veteran communities. There are approximately 22 million veterans in the United States, and Pennsylvania is home to nearly 1 million. The majority of veterans return to our communities as leaders and lead exemplary lives; however, not every veteran's path is straightforward. That is why we need to make sure the right programs and support services are in place.

According to the Department of Justice, in 2011 and 2012, approximately 8 percent of the total incarcerated population in the United States were, in fact, veterans. These veterans found themselves serving time in correctional facilities because they had not received the treatment they needed. While this represents a very small percentage of veterans, it is important that we support programs like veterans treatment courts for veterans who face significant obstacles returning to civilian life, including mental health concerns, post-traumatic stress disorder, and substance abuse issues. These treatment courts can have a lifelong impact on a veteran by helping them get out of the criminal justice system and get the necessary treatment they have earned. It is our obligation to work every day to ensure veterans are receiving the care and support they deserve.

There are many stories from across Pennsylvania and our country that exemplify why these veterans treatment courts are critical. Just to give one, shortly after Michael Colletti from Montgomery County received an honorable discharge from the U.S. Coast Guard, he found himself in the grips of a serious addiction to opioids. To support his growing habit, Michael began stealing from his employer, resulting in his arrest and jail time. His crimes were caused by his opioid use disorder, and Michael found himself in the Montgomery County Veterans Treatment Court.

Finally, getting the accountability he needed and connecting with the benefits he earned as a veteran, Michael began the process of leaving behind his life of addiction and crime to start a new path. Today, Michael Colletti is a partner in a successful small business and a mentor to others in his community struggling with their own substance use.

He says of the veterans treatment court:

> I wouldn't be here without the support network from the court. I wouldn't have my girlfriend, I wouldn't have my beautiful place, I wouldn't have my career, and most importantly, I wouldn't have the sound clarity of mind to be myself again. Now I am committed to paying it forward.

I and I know many others are proud to support a recent letter led by our colleagues, Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator WICKER, highlighting the importance of funding the Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program and veterans treatment courts. As we go through the appropriations process, I urge my colleagues to consider the proven track record of these courts in improving outcome for graduates, and I hope Congress will offer strong support for these important programs that have been helping the justice system better serve individuals, veterans, their families, friends, and communities.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. TILLIS. 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.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for June 2017. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2017, S. Con. Res. 3. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budget points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

My last filing can be found in the RECORD on April 27, 2017. The information contained in this report captures

legislative activity since that filing through June 5, 2017.

Republican Budget Committee staff prepared Tables 1–3 of this report.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the most recently adopted budget resolution. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. For this reporting period, 13 of the 16 authorizing committees are in compliance with their allocations. Legislative activity involving the appropriations process, continuing resolution and omnibus, during the last reporting period includes provisions, such as changes to health benefits for miners and Medicaid funding, charged to the Committee on Finance that caused it to breach its allocation. The other two committees in breach, as previously reported, are the Committee on Veterans Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. In total, authorizing committees are estimated to increase outlays by $292 million more than they were allocated over the fiscal year 2017–2026 period. Of that $292 million in violations, $91 million stems from the Finance Committee's violations during this reporting period.

Table 2 gives the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations exceeds or is below the statutory spending limits for fiscal year 2017. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in sections 312 and 314 of the CBA. H.R. 244, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, P.L. 115–31, provided full-year appropriations for the current fiscal year. These appropriations, $551.1 billion for defense and $518.5 billion for nondefense, were consistent with the statutory limits imposed by the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Table 3 tracks compliance with the fiscal year 2017 limit for overall changes in mandatory programs, CHIMPS, in appropriations bills, established in the fiscal year 2016 budget resolution. CHIMPS in the Consolidated Appropriations Act were consistent with this year's limit of $19.1 billion. This information is used for determining points of order under section 3103 of that resolution.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by the Congress.

CBO provided a spending and revenue report for fiscal year 2017, which helps enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under CBA section 311. CBO's estimates show that current-law levels of spending for fiscal year 2017 are below the amounts assumed in the budget resolution by $303 million in budget authority and $6.4 billion in outlays. CBO also estimates that revenues are $1 million above assumed levels for fiscal year 2017, but $21 million below assumed levels for the fiscal year 2017–2026 period. Social Security levels are consistent with the budget resolution's fiscal year 2017 figures.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO, rule. The Senate's PAYGO scorecard currently shows increased deficits of $226 million over the fiscal year 2016–2021 and $227 million over fiscal year 2016–2026 periods. For both periods, outlays have increased by $201 million, while revenues decreased by $25 million over the 6-year period and $26 million over the 11-year period. Missing from these levels are the budgetary effects of divisions M-O of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 and the miners' health provisions of H.J. Res. 99, the short-term continuing resolution, P.L. 115–30, which are required to be excluded based on language in the acts. The consolidated appropriations bill, however, is recorded as reducing revenues by $24 million and $25 million over the fiscal year 2016–2021 and fiscal year 2016–2026 periods, respectively. That revenue loss is found in the appropriations section of the bill, not covered by the exclusion, which includes provisions related to visa-program extensions and insurance coverage of mammography. The Senate's PAYGO rule is enforced by section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21, the fiscal year 2008 budget resolution.

Finally, included in this submission is a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor. No budget points of order have been raised since my last filing.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (−) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2017	2017–2021	2017–2026
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Armed Services			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation			
Budget Authority	1	1	1
Outlays	1	1	1
Energy and Natural Resources			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Environment and Public Works			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Finance			
Budget Authority	−239	468	−204
Outlays	38	763	91
Foreign Relations			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Judiciary			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Rules and Administration			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Intelligence			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	200	200
Indian Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Small Business			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Total			
Budget Authority	−238	469	−203
Outlays	39	964	292

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS [1]

[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2017	
	Security [2]	Nonsecurity [2]
Statutory Discretionary Limits	551,068	518,531
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	20,877
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,200	51,355
Defense	515,977	138
Energy and Water Development	19,956	17,815
Financial Services and General Government	33	21,482
Homeland Security	1,876	40,532
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	32,280
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	161,025
Legislative Branch	0	4,440
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	7,726	74,650
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	36,586
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	300	57,351
Current Level Total	551,068	518,531
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (−) Statutory Limits	0	0

[1] This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

[2] Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]

	2017
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2017	19,100
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	741
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	8,452
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	826
Homeland Security	187
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	28
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	8,009
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	857
Current Level Total	19,100
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	0

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2017 budget and is current through June 5, 2017. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 3, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2017.

Since our last letter dated April 27, 2017, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following legislation that has significant effects on budget authority, outlays, and revenues in fiscal year 2017: A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes (Public Law 115–30); and Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (Public Law 115–31).

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AS OF JUNE 5, 2017

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (−) Resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget Authority	3,329.3	3,329.0	−0.3
Outlays	3,268.2	3,261.8	−6.4
Revenues	2,682.1	2,682.1	0.0
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security Outlays [a]	805.4	805.4	0.0
Social Security Revenues	826.0	826.0	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

[a] Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AS OF JUNE 5, 2017

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted [a] [b]			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,682,088
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,054,297	1,960,884	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	132,558	614,655	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−834,250	−834,301	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,352,605	1,741,238	2,682,088
Enacted Legislation:			
National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–10)	1	1	0
A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–30)	2	2	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–31)	1,967,450	1,518,744	1
Total, Enacted Legislation	1,967,453	1,518,747	1
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	8,928	1,795	0
Total Current Level [c]	3,328,986	3,261,780	2,682,089
Total Senate Resolution [d]	3,329,289	3,268,171	2,682,088
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	1
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	303	6,391	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2017–2026:			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	32,351,639
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	32,351,660
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	21

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

[a] Includes the budgetary effects of enacted legislation cleared by the Congress during the 114th session, prior to the adoption of S. Con. Res. 3, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2017.

[b] Sections 193–195 of Division A of P.L. 114–254 provided funding, available until expended, for innovation projects and state responses to opioid abuse. CEO estimates that, for fiscal year 2017:

The $20 million in discretionary budget authority provided by section 193 would result in an additional $5 million in outlays for FDA innovation projects;

The $352 million in discretionary budget authority provided by section 194 would result in an additional $91 million in outlays for NIH innovation projects;

The $500 million in discretionary budget authority provided by section 195 would result in an additional $160 million in outlays for state response to opioid abuse.

Consistent with sections 1001–1004 of P.L. 114–255, for the purposes of estimating the discretionary budget authority and outlays for these provisions under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Act of 1985, those amounts are estimated to provide no budget authority or outlays.

[c] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

[d] Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in S. Con. Res. 3, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The total for the Initial Senate Resolution shown below excludes $81,872 million in budget authority and $40,032 million in outlays assumed in S. Con. Res. 3 for non regular discretionary spending, including spending that qualifies for adjustments to discretionary spending limits pursuant to section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. The total for the Revised Senate Resolution shown below includes amounts for non regular discretionary spending:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Initial Senate Resolution	3,226,128	3,224,630	2,682,088
Revisions:			
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	103,161	43,541	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,329,289	3,268,171	2,682,088

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS, AS OF JUNE 5, 2017

[In millions of dollars]

	2017–2021	2017–2026
Beginning Balance [a]	0	0
Enacted Legislation: [b] [c] [d]		
Tested Ability to Leverage Exceptional National Talent Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–1)	*	*
Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule (P.L. 115–5)	*	*
National Aeronautics and Space Administration Transition Authorization Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–10)	1	1
Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues (P.L. 115–14)	*	*
Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Clarification of Employer's Continuing Obligation to Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness" (P.L. 115–21)	1	1
Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by qualified State political subdivisions for non-governmental employees (P.L. 115–24)	*	*
An act to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to modify the termination date for the Veterans Choice Program, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–26)	200	200
Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–30) [e]	*	*
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–31) [f]	24	25
U.S. Wants to Compete for a World Expo Act (P.L. 115–32)	*	*
Modernizing Government Travel Act (P.L. 115–34)	*	*
Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees (P.L. 115–35)	*	*
Follow the Rules Act (H.R. 657)	*	*
Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvement Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–36)	*	*
A bill to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum (S. 1083)	*	*
Current Balance	226	227
Memorandum:	2017–2021	2017–2026
Changes to Revenues	−25	−26
Changes to Outlays	201	201

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: P.L. = Public Law; *= between −$500,000 and $500,000.

[a] Pursuant to the statement printed in the Congressional Record on January 17, 2017, the Senate Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard was reset to zero.

[b] The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.

[c] Excludes off-budget amounts.

[d] Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.

[e] CBO estimates that this joint resolution will increase the deficit by $2 million over the 2017–2021 period. Pursuant to section 202(c) of P.L. 115–30, the budgetary effects of this joint resolution are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard.

[f] Division M of P.L. 115–31 contains the Health Benefits for Miners Act of 2017 and the Puerto Rico Section 1108(g) Amendment of 2017. Division N contains the HIRE Vets Act. CBO estimates that the provisions in Divisions M and N will increase the deficit by $757 million over the 2017–2021 period, and by $84 million over the 2017–2026 period. Pursuant to section 301(b) of Division M, the budgetary effects of Division M and succeeding divisions are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee 's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unaminous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16–84, concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services estimated to cost $662 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16–84

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment $482 million.

Other $180 million.

Total $662 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Twenty-six (26) each AN/TPQ–53(V) Radar Systems to include Solid State Phased Array Radar with KN–4083 Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) enhanced Land/Sea Inertial Navigation System (INS) and automatic leveling system.

Eight hundred and forty (840), M931 Full Range Training Round, 120mm Projectiles with M781 fuzes (for live fire exercise).

Two thousand, two hundred and forty (2,240), M107, 155MM Projectiles with M557 fuzes (for live fire exercise).

Non-MDE includes: Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio Systems (SINCGARS) and accessories; Defense Advanced Global Positioning System (GPS) Receiver (DAGR) equipment and accessories; Miltope laptops and accessories; Medium Tactical Vehicles FMTV M1092 5-ton trucks/chassis with support and accessories; software support; support equipment; classroom simulators; government furnished equipment; technical manuals and publications; essential spares and repair parts; consumables; live fire exercise and ammunition; tools and test equipment; training; transportation; U.S. Government technical support and logistic support; contractor technical support; repair and return support; quality assurance teams; in-country Field Service Representative (FSR) and other associated equipment and services.

(iv) Military Department: Army (ZAI).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Annex Attached.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 5, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia—AN/TPO–53(V) Radar Systems and Related Support

The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has requested a possible sale of twenty-six (26) AN/TPQ–53(V) Radar Systems to include Solid State Phased Array Radar with KN–4083 Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) enhanced Land/Sea Inertial Navigation System (INS) and automatic leveling system; Eight hundred and forty (840), M931, 120mm Projectiles with M781 fuzes (for live fire exercise); Two thousand, two hundred and forty (2,240), M107, 155MM Projectiles with M557 fuzes (for live fire exercise); Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio Systems (SINCGARS) and accessories; Defense Advanced Global Positioning System (GPS) Receiver (DAGR) equipment and accessories; Miltope laptops and accessories; Medium Tactical Vehicles FMTV M1092 5-ton trucks/chassis with support and accessories; software support; support equipment; classroom simulators; government furnished equipment; technical manuals and publications; essential spares and repair parts; consumables; live fire exercise and ammunition; tools and test equipment; training; transportation; U.S. Government technical support and logistic support; contractor technical support; repair and return support; quality assurance teams; in-country Field Service Representative (FSR) and other associated equipment and services. The total estimated program cost is $662 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of an important partner which has been and continues to be a leading contributor of political stability and economic growth in the Middle East.

Saudi Arabia intends to use these radars to support its border security requirements and modernize its armed forces with a more current capability to locate and counter the source of incoming ballistic artillery, rockets, and mortars. This will contribute to Saudi Arabia's goal to update its military capability while further enhancing greater interoperability among Saudi Arabia, the United States and other allies. Saudi Arabia will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The Lockheed Martin Corporation, Liverpool, New York, is the principal contractor for the AN/TPQ–53(V) Radars. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require U.S. Government or contractor representatives to travel to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for a period of four (4) months for in-processing/fielding, system checkout and new equipment training, as well as providing the support of two in-country FSRs for two years.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of the proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16–84

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AN/TPQ–53(V) radar system is a highly mobile radar that automatically detects, classifies, tracks, and locates the point of origin of projectiles fired from mortar, artillery and rocket systems with sufficient accuracy for first round fire for effect. It mitigates close combat radar coverage gaps and replaces the AN/TPQ–36 and AN/TPQ–37 Firefinder Radars; fully supporting Brigade Combat Teams (BCT), Division Artilleries (DIVARTYs), and Field Artillery (FA) Brigades. Designed to be transported by ship, trucks, train, or aircraft, it is capable of deploying as part of the counter-rocket, artillery, and mortar system of systems to provide a sense and warn capability for fixed and semi-fixed sites. The AN/TPQ–53(V) provides a net ready system with increased range and accuracy throughout a 90 degree search sector (stare mode) as well as 360-degree coverage (rotating).

a. The Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) hardware design of the AN/TPQ–53(V) is UNCLASSIFIED. Foreign source systems of similar design and capability are available in advanced industrial nations such as Sweden and Israel.

b. The AN/TPQ–53(V) software gives it an enhanced capability in terms of target detection and classification in an Electronic Countermeasure (ECM) environment. Release of detailed knowledge of the software code or test data could aid an adversary trying to identify ways of countering the detection capabilities of the AN/TPQ–53(V) or improve the performance of their own radar systems. Although the detection, classification technology, and concept used in the AN/TPQ–53(V) has been utilized for more than a decade, the ability to incorporate such technology on a solid state air cooled radar would be a major technological improvement. The software is UNCLASSIFIED. The system is classified SECRET when employed in a theater of operations.

c. The Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (SINCGARS) is a tactical radio providing secure jam-resistant voice and data communications of command, control, targeting, and technical information for the AN/TPQ–53(V) radar system. The spread-spectrum frequency hopping Electronic Counter-Counter Measures (ECCM) technology resident in the radio is sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED. While sensitive, the frequency-hopping algorithms used to generate the ECCM waveform are unique to the country of ownership and cannot be manipulated by potential adversaries for use or interference with other countries possessing SINCGARS technology. Should a potential adversary come into possession of one of these radios, they would have the potential to intercept operational command, control, and targeting information. This potential problem is mitigated by the fact that the customer can secure information passed over the radio network using a commercial grade security capability equivalent to an AES 256-bit encryption system whose keys are controlled by the customer country.

d. The Defense Advanced Global Positioning System (GPS) Receiver (DAGR) is a handheld GPS location device with map background displaying the user's location. Unlike commercial grade GPS receivers capable of receiving Standard Positioning Signals (SPS) from GPS satellites, the DAGR is capable of receiving Precise Positioning Signals (PPS). PPS satellite signals provide significantly more accurate location data than do SPS signals. This capability within DAGR is possible due to the Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM). The SAASM is an encrypted device permitting both receipt of PPS signals and the benefit of preventing potential adversaries from spoofing the system to display incorrect location information. The SAASM capability within the DAGR is sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED. The SAASM capabilities are sensitive due to the system's ability to access

restricted PPS GPS satellite signals and to prevent spoofing. While sensitive, the ability of potential adversaries to exploit the system are limited. The SAASM chip goes through a special process of loading encryption signals and unique access codes keyed to the customer country. These processes are strictly controlled by the US Air Force. If the DAGR is compromised, the US Air Force can cut off the device access to PPS signals and the anti-spoofing capability.

e. The same SAASM capabilities resident in the DAGR are also resident in the AN/TPQ–53(V) KN–4083 Inertial Navigation System (INS). The KN–4083 is a SAASM enhanced INS capability with a 3-axis Monolithic Ring Laser Gyro allowing extremely accurate location as well as 3-axis accelerometer to provide angular information regarding the radar position (i.e. pitch, roll, and azimuth data). While inertial navigation and accelerometer capabilities are well-known, the SAASM capability within the system makes it sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED. As with the DAGR, the US Air Force can cut off access to PPS signals and anti-spoofing capabilities, minimizing impacts should a potential adversary obtain the system.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific radar hardware and software elements, the information could be used to identify ways of countering the detection capabilities of the AN/TPQ–53(V) Radar System or improve the performance of their radar systems. Testing and identification of methods to defeat the AN/TPQ–53(V) ECCM capabilities would lead to improvements in the overall effectiveness of an adversary's system and improve their survivability.

3. A determination has been made that Saudi Arabia can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate adopted the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act. This legislation facilitates the process of terminating nonperforming VA employees by eliminating certain due process protections that are currently part of the system. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs says he needs this authority to reform the system. The Senate, by voice vote, honored the request. However, in Alaska, we have a different problem which is not addressed in the legislation, and that problem is filling vacant positions within the VA. The major challenge facing VA leaders in Alaska is recruitment and retention.

The Wasilla community based outpatient clinic, CBOC, serves veterans in the fastest growing community in the State. The last permanent physician at this CBOC resigned in May 2014, citing ''excessive workload.'' A number of temporary physicians have rotated through since, and some have considered VA employment, but ultimately said no. The fact remains that, for the past 3 years, the VA has not been able to recruit a single physician to permanently staff this CBOC, a facility that, given demand, requires a permanent staff of two—or possibly three—physicians. Wasilla is hardly the most remote place in the State. Actually, it is one of the least remote. Moreover, it is one of the most desirable places in Alaska to live. For example, Mat-Su Regional Hospital, the community hospital down the road, has no problem retaining medical professionals. Staffed with 160 physicians in 28 specialties, including primary care, it was recently highlighted by Becker's Hospital Review as one of the 150 best places to work in healthcare for 2017. By comparison, the VA has been unable to recruit a single physician to permanently tend to the needs of our veterans in the Mat-Su Valley.

That suggests to me that the VA has a second problem. The VA is simply not regarded as an employer of choice among potential recruits. Removing due process protections for VA employees may well exacerbate that problem. Over the past 14 years, I have spent time with a great many VA employees, and the fear that a supervisor may now have greater latitude to target an individual on a trumped up charge because they are seen to be rocking the boat or because they just don't like them is a real one. We have very good management in the Alaska VA healthcare system now, but the faces of managers change with some frequency and with those charges can come wide swings in management philosophies.

At a recent hearing of the MILCON-VA subcommittee, my friend from Florida, Senator RUBIO, asked Dr. Shulkin, ''In your time at the Veterans Administration, have you ever seen or do you have any evidence of any instance in which supervisors targeted individuals for dismissal because they just don't like them and were going to make something up in order to get rid of them?'' While the official transcript is not yet available, we do have the CQ transcript. That transcript indicates that Dr. Shulkin did not directly answer the question. He responded that the VA has seen cases of documented whistleblower retaliation.

But not every employee who faces inequity in the workplace becomes a whistleblower. Some just go out and find a new job which offers better working conditions and in some cases better money than the VA pays.

To his credit, Dr. Shulkin went on to say, ''But, I want people to understand, I am not seeking this and I do not support your legislation so that we can willy-nilly fire employees, or allow supervisors to abuse our employees. This allows due process. I believe it's very important that our employees have due process, the right to pre-decisional appeals, and the right to be represented by the union or their attorneys.''

I hope that he is right about how this will work out on the ground, but the VA is a highly decentralized system with a great many seemingly autonomous decisionmakers. In asking for this new authority, Dr. Shulkin must accept the responsibility for ensuring that it is not abused and must also accept accountability in the event that it is, but the larger question is whether all of the energy we have put into legislating VA accountability does anything to make the VA a more attractive employer to in-demand healthcare professionals. I would like to see the VA devote as much energy and creativity to addressing this challenge as it has to the issue before us yesterday.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

GRANITE MOUNTAIN/SPECULATOR MINE FIRE

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I wish to remember metal mining's greatest disaster, the Granite Mountain/Speculator Mine Fire that took place 100 years ago in Butte, MT, that claimed the lives of 168 men.

On the night of June 8, 1917, approximately 410 men were in the mine, working to meet the demand for copper that was created by our Armed Forces on the frontlines during World War I. An electric cable had been lowered into the mine earlier in the day and had gotten away from the workers, falling into a tangled coil. Later that evening, as crews examined the damaged cable, a lamp accidentally ignited the cable and sparked a fire that would fill the mine with smoke and poisonous gas.

Unable to lower cages due to fire damage, in an act of pure bravery, over 100 rescue workers immediately jumped into harm's way to try to rescue their trapped brothers. Miraculously, none of the rescue workers were killed, but sadly, after the conclusion of rescue efforts, a total of 168 miners were lost. The community of Butte grieved together, as did the entire Montana family.

Today I want to honor those who perished that tragic day and honor those whose families who would never be the same after it. Would you please join me in a brief moment of silence to remember those miners and their families?

This proclamation is meant to recognize the strength of those Montanans who sacrificed their lives in support our Nation's military work in World War I, as well as those who jumped to help a fallen brother without question. The tragedy that befell our mining community highlights the strength found in the hearts of not only Montanans, but all Americans, and the moments that make heroes out of ordinary men and bring communities together.

So that future generations will not forget the men who perished that day, a memorial was built in honor of those who died in the Granite Mountain/

Speculator Mine Fire. If you are ever in our beautiful State, I hope you will take time to visit.

One hundred years after this tragedy, we are also reminded of how far we have come in hard rock mining. Jobs that were once seen as high risk are now very desirable, not just due to high wages, but more importantly because of advances in safety. In fact, according to the Department of Labor, fiscal year 2016 was the safest year in mining history. The continued progress toward safer mining has been a shared effort across State and Federal agencies, as well as the mining community itself. New technology, better practices, special initiatives, and improved training have led to a culture in mining communities and industry that prioritizes safety. The Granite Mountain/Speculator Mine Fire reminds us so that we must continue to push for even safer mining.

Lastly, I want to take a moment to thank those hard rock miners who are spread across our beautiful country and who continue to serve the American people. Thank you for all that you do. We must continue to prioritize safety that we never again have a tragedy like that of the Granite Mountain/Speculator Mine Fire.●

TRIBUTE TO HELEN AND BOBBY FELDMAN

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Helen and Bobby Feldman for their strong leadership in the Jewish community. Bobby and Helen have been involved in a number of causes that celebrate their Jewish heritage as well as make a difference by putting the needs and well-being of others before themselves.

Bobby and Helen have worked with many organizations, including Stand With Us, an organization dedicated to educating individuals all over the world about Israel and ways to combat anti-Semitism, and HonestReporting, a media watchdog organization dedicated to providing facts, figures, and statistics to journalists across the world to ensure Israel's story is told fairly by the media.

Bobby Feldman's interest in Jewish culture and causes stemmed from his early interest in environmental issues. He worked with the Jewish National Fund in Las Vegas where he now serves as the president of the southern Nevada chapter. Their organization is working to revitalize areas in Israel by planting trees, creating parks, and working to build a better country for years to come.

Helen Feldman has a list of accomplishments herself. She helped organize the Women's Alliance of the Jewish National Fund. This organization encourages future generations of Las Vegas women to celebrate our solidarity with Israel. She also volunteered her time at local nursing homes; there she shows off her amazing singing talents and brightens the day of so many Nevada seniors.

On Sunday, April 30, the Jewish National Fund is hosting their annual Love of Israel brunch where both Helen and Bobby will be recognized for their involvement in the community. These two individuals should be proud of all that they have done together.

Earlier this week, Israel celebrated their Holocaust Remembrance Day, honoring and remembering the 6 million Jewish people who were the victims of Nazi hatred. It serves us all as a reminder for the need to turn away prejudice and racism and embrace others. That is why I am both humbled and honored to acknowledge Helen and Bobby for their work here in the great State of Nevada. I also want to congratulate them on 29 years of marriage, and I look forward to seeing more from them as they continue to make us all very proud.●

TRIBUTE TO BETTY FOX

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Betty Fox and not only wish her a happy birthday, but also reflect on her years of service. Betty Fox served her country in the Armed Forces and remains an active leader in the community. On April 22, Betty Fox turned 98 years old, and to this day, she makes us proud to call her a fellow Nevadan and American.

Betty Fox joined the Marine Corps in April 1943 shortly after the beginning of World War II. She was stationed at the Marine Corps Air Station, MCAS, located in Cherry Point, NC. She was then sent to the MCAS in El Toro, CA, there she received the Honorable Service Lapel Button marking her outstanding service to her country. Betty Fox was promoted to private first class on August 20, 1943, then to corporal on January 24, 1944. She was discharged on February 5, 1944, but her promotions and designations reflect on her service and our country will never be able to fully repay her for the sacrifices she made in the defense of freedom.

In 1956, she moved to Las Vegas, NV, and has been a Nevadan ever since. Despite no longer being Active military personnel, Betty Fox remains involved in the local community. She epitomizes an age-old saying: ''You are only as old as you feel.''

Betty Fox volunteered at the Las Vegas convention center for the past 18 years. She is an active, lifetime member of the Marine Corps League, Local Detachment 186, and has marched in several Veteran's Day parades in order to honor those who, like her, sacrificed to defend America and its values.

Betty is also a lifetime member of Women Marine Association, WMA, and was an active member until the local chapter disbanded. After years of serving her country and community, she volunteered her time at the local senior living center, brightening the day of many of Nevada's senior citizens.

I am both humbled and honored to acknowledge Betty Fox for her service to our country and community. Her sacrifices and continued commitment to helping those who served makes me proud to call her a fellow Nevadan. As Nevada's senior Senator, I want to honor her success, her life of giving back, and wish her the happiest 98th birthday. Rest assured, we all look forward to her continued efforts that are sure to inspire us all.●

RECOGNIZING THE WOMEN'S MINING COALITION

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Women's Mining Coalition, a Nevada-born group that has devoted 25 years of service advocating for a strong U.S. mining industry. I am proud to honor the significant contributions the Women's Mining Coalition has made to the mining industry in the State of Nevada and throughout our Nation. I am extremely proud of their successes and am grateful for how it has benefited the Silver State.

In 1993, three Nevada geologists—Kathy Benedetto, Ruth Carraher, and Debbie Struhsacker—started the Women's Mining Coalition in response to the congressional debate to enact major changes to the U.S. mining law that would threaten the future of Nevada's mining industry and hard rock mining throughout the country. At that time, they never dreamed that their concept would involve more than taking a couple of trips to Washington, to talk to lawmakers about mineral exploration, the importance of mining, and that mining is a good career for women, but this Battle-Born Nevada concept has become a nationwide, quarter-century commitment to talk to Members of Congress about how modern mining provides the building blocks of our society while caring for the environment and providing family-wage jobs to miners and the many companies throughout the country that provide equipment, goods, and services to the mineral exploration and mining sectors.

Each year, WMC's Nevada members travel to the group's annual Washington, DC fly-in. These Nevada women represent the diverse domestic mining industry and discuss legislative issues and proposed rules affecting mining. During these meetings, WMC members put a face to mining that lawmakers don't expect: women involved in all facets of mining, from equipment operators and manufacturers, engineers, executives, miners, metallurgists, geologists, and environmental scientists.

Last September at a banquet in Las Vegas, the group received the prestigious Prazen Living Legends of Mining Award from the National Mining Hall of Fame for their many years of service and commitment to the mining industry. Not resting on their laurels, the Women's Mining Coalition is in Washington, DC, this week to continue their work to let Congress know that a strong mining industry is essential to the future of Nevada and our Nation.

Our national defense, our infrastructure, our electricity, our technology, our agriculture, our transportation, and communication capabilities all rely on the products of mining. The Women's Mining Coalition will continue to make this message heard with energy, talent, and enthusiasm.

As the senior Senator from the Silver State, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in congratulating the Women's Mining Coalition on its 25 years of thoughtful advocacy on behalf of mining in Nevada and across the country. This group has advanced Nevada's mining industry, and I am honored to recognize this important contribution. I wish the Women's Mining Coalition well in its future endeavors in creating greater opportunities for mining in our great State.●

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.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:32 a.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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1628. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

H.R. 2192. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the non-application of certain State waiver provisions to Members of Congress and congressional staff.

At 10:27 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 390. An act to provide emergency relief for victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 2004(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation: Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 603 of the Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–323), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Minority Leader appoints the following individual to the Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission: Mr. Pete Gallego of Alpine, Texas.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 390. An act to provide for emergency relief for victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2192. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the non-application of certain State waiver provisions to Members of Congress and congressional staff; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1628. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 286. A bill to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–92).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

Nominee: William F. Hagerty.

Post: Ambassador to Japan.

Nominated: 03/27/2017.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, date, amount, and donee:

1. Self: William F. Hagerty 9/1/16, 2,700.00, Trump Victory; 9/1/16, 2,700.00, Trump of President; 6/29/16, 5,400.00, John McCain; 5/25/16, 5,000.00, RNC/Convention; 5/22/16, 1,000.00, David Kustoff; 2/29/16, 2,700.00, Marco Rubio; 1/8/16, 33,400.00, RNC; 1/8/16, 1,600.00, RNC; 9/1/15, 5,000.00, TennPAC; 6/30/15, 2,700.00, Jeb Bush; 6/5/15, 3,000.00, TNGOP; 5/27/15, 2,500.00, Healthcare Freedom Fund; 4/21/15, 33,400.00, RNC; 11/3/14, 2,600.00, Lamar Alexander; 10/21/14, 1,000.00, David Perdue; 4/17/14, 1,000.00, John Ratcliffe; 2/17/14, 2,000.00, Keith Crisco; 2/3/14, 3,000.00, TNGOP; 12/30/13, 1,000.00, Jim Tracy; 12/18/13, 1,000.00, John Ratcliffe; 12/10/13, 1,000.00, Marsha Blackburn; 9/3/13, 2,600.00, Diane Black; 8/14/13, 2,600.00, Lamar Alexander; 2/11/13, 3,000.00, TNGOP; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Republican Party of Idaho; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Republican State Comm of Mass; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Oklahoma Leadership Council; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, VT Rep Fed. Elections Cmte; 6/22/12, 2,000.00, TNGOP; 6/21/12, 2,500.00, TennPAC; 6/21/12, 2,500.00, Alexander for Senate; 5/17/12, 50,000.00, Romney Victory; 5/17/12, 30,800.00, RNC; 5/17/12, 2,500.00, Mitt Romney; 5/9/12, 350.00, TNGOP.

2. Spouse: Christine L Hagerty: 9/1/16, 2,700.00, Trump Victory; 9/1/16, 2,700.00, Trump for President; 6/28/16, 5,400.00, John McCainPrimary/Gen; 2/29/16, 2,700.00, Marco Rubio; 1/8/16, 1,600.00, RNC; 1/8/16, 33,400.00, RNC; 6/30/15, 2,700.00, Jeb Bush; 11/3/14, 2,600.00, Lamar Alexander; 8/14/13, 2,600.00, Lamar Alexander; 9/3/13, 2,400.00, Diane Black; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Republican Party of Mass; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Oklahoma Leadership Council; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Vermont Repub Federal Elections Cmte; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Republican Party of Idaho; 6/13/12, 2,500.00, Mitt Romney; 6/13/12, 30,800.00, RNC; 6/13/12, 50,000.00, Romney Victory.

3. Children and Spouses: William F. Hagerty—none; Stephen L. Hagerty—none; Tara E. Hagerty—none; Christine B. Hagerty—none.

4. Parents: William Hagerty, III—Deceased; Ruth Hagerty, $1000.00, 3/1/07 Mitt Romney; William Locke-Paddon—Deceased; Terry Locke-Paddon—none.

5. Grandparents: William F. Hagerty, Jr.—Deceased; Lillian Dwiggins Hagerty—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Michael Hagerty—none; Robin Hagerty—none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Elizabeth Hagerty—none.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1298. A bill to modify the criteria used by the Corps of Engineers to dredge small ports; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1299. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1300. A bill to prohibit the indefinite detention of persons by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1301. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1302. A bill to provide for the conversion of temporary judgeships to permanent judgeships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1303. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1304. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude customary prompt pay discounts from manufacturers to wholesalers from the average sales price for drugs and biologicals under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1305. A bill to provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection with adequate flexibility in its employment authorities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish refundable tax credits for expenses relating to ensuring safety and accessibility in historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility to receive refundable tax credits for coverage under a qualified health plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1308. A bill to increase authorized funding for the Soo Locks; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1309. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit American Indian tribal councils to enter into agreements with the Commissioner of Social Security to obtain social security coverage for services performed by tribal council members; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1310. A bill to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1311. A bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1312. A bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1313. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1314. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to bolster fairness and transparency in consideration of interstate natural gas pipelines, to provide for greater public input opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 185. A resolution recognizing and expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Water Safety Month; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. Res. 186. A resolution recognizing the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, as the national aviation cadet museum of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 187. A resolution congratulating and honoring Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory on 50 years of groundbreaking discoveries; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to provide for nonpreemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 301

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 301, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against providers of health services that are not involved in abortion.

S. 319

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs a center of excellence in the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of health conditions relating to exposure to burn pits.

S. 341

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 341, a bill to provide for congressional oversight of actions to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

S. 379

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 379, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 447

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 447, a bill to require reporting on acts of certain foreign countries on Holocaust era assets and related issues.

S. 486

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 749

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 749, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the disclosure of the annual percentage rates applicable to Federal student loans.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 806

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 806, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act to ensure College for All.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes.

S. 1018

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1018, a bill to provide humanitarian assistance for the Venezuelan people, to defend democratic governance and combat widespread public corruption in Venezuela, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, supra.

S. 1055

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1055, a bill to restrict the exportation of certain defense articles to the Philippine National Police, to work with the Philippines to support civil society and a public health approach to substance abuse, to report on Chinese and other sources of narcotics to the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1068, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for increased investment in clean energy.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1099, a bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards.

S. 1129

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1129, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

S. 1146

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1146, a bill to enhance the ability of the Office of the National Ombudsman to assist small businesses in meeting regulatory requirements and develop outreach initiatives to promote awareness of the services the Office of the National Ombudsman provides, and for other purposes.

S. 1154

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1154, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the housing treatment of members of the Armed Forces and their spouses and dependents undergoing a permanent change of station in the United States, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 42

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 42, a joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles.

S.J. RES. 44

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 44, a joint resolution condemning the deadly attack on May 26, 2017, in Portland, Oregon, expressing deepest condolences to the families and friends of the victims, and supporting efforts to overcome hatred, bigotry, and violence.

S. RES. 136

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 136, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

S. RES. 174

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 174, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1305. A bill to provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection with adequate flexibility in its employment authorities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Customs and Border Protection Hiring and Retention Act, or CBP HiRe Act.

In recent years, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or CBP, has had a lot of trouble recruiting, hiring, and retaining personnel to adequately staff the border and our ports of entry. Today, CBP is nearly 1,000 officers below the mandated staffing levels. The Border Patrol, whose duty it is to secure 6,000 miles of borderlands, suffers from a shortage of more than 1,800 agents. These shortages persist, despite ample backing and funding from Congress and the threat they pose to both national security and trade-reliant communities and economies, particularly in my State of Arizona. This has been frustrating for border communities across the country, but it is especially problematic for Arizona, a State that depends on both border security and a lot of cross-border trade.

For example, the Nogales port of entry in Southern Arizona is one of the busiest ports in the United States. It processes approximately $2.5 billion worth of produce each year. Arizona alone does about $15 billion in trade with Mexico alone, every year. Mexican shoppers spend about $8 million in stores in Arizona every day.

However, the port currently is suffering from a 23-percent shortage of CBP officers. Our ports cannot effectively and efficiently facilitate the flow of commerce across the border without adequate staffing.

One of the biggest challenges in both retaining and hiring new officers and agents for frontline positions has been the remoteness of CBP installations. CBP officers and border agents are often stationed in geographically remote and isolated locations. This likely contributes to the fact that, of those leaving the agency, nearly 30 percent of Border Patrol agents and over 10 percent of CBP officers are lost to other agencies.

Massive staffing shortages aside, CBP is barely able to hire fast enough to fill the jobs left by departing agents and officers. So we have great needs that are not being filled, but we also have attrition we simply can't replace. In fact, CBP hires only 1 out of every 64 applicants for officer positions, and 1 out of every 113 applicants for Border Patrol agent positions. This means that less than 2 percent of applicants manage to get through CBP's hiring process. The situation at CBP today is simply unsustainable.

Congress can't sit idly by as slow hiring rates and accelerating attrition threaten the security of our borders and the underpinnings of our economy. To that end, I am pleased to introduce my CBP HiRe Act with Senator

HEITKAMP from North Dakota. This legislation would streamline the hiring process and allow the CBP to finally bring more agents and officers into frontline positions.

Importantly, this bill gives CBP new tools to recruit and retain personnel in remote and hard-to-fill locations. This includes special salary rates and recruitment, relocation, and retention incentives.

In addition, the bill will eliminate bureaucratic redtape by giving CBP the authority to use direct-hire authority and to expedite the hiring of qualified applicants. Right now, the situation is that they have to deal with other Federal agencies and get virtually every incentive and program they want to approve and need to approve to hire more officers. They have to run it up the flagpole so many times with Federal agencies that it simply takes too long.

Lastly, the bill prevents CBP from disclosing an applicant's polygraph results with another Federal agency or non-Federal employer. Challenges relating to the administering of the polygraph have resulted in approximately 65 percent of the individuals failing the test.

Think about that. People who are in another law enforcement position, even those who have taken a polygraph before just a year or two prior—many of them fear that a false positive on a polygraph exam might impact their ability to move to another Federal agency if that is disclosed. If you have a polygraph, which can't be used in courts of law because it is not perfect or nowhere near perfect, then Federal agencies shouldn't be able to forward that to other Federal agencies. It acts as a big disincentive for people to apply for these positions because a false positive on a polygraph exam might imperil their chances to work for another Federal agency or to work in law enforcement later in their career. This also creates a disincentive, as I mentioned, for individuals to want to be hired by CBP.

In Arizona, safety and prosperity are inextricably linked to CBP's ability to secure the border and facilitate trade. The CBP HiRe Act will give CBP the tools and flexibility necessary to accomplish these missions.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan solution, and I look forward to seeing it move through the Senate without delay.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish refundable tax credits for expenses relating to ensuring safety and accessibility in historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, founded more than two centuries ago, Vermont boasts a trove of historically preserved buildings, structures, and towns. These are part of our heritage, and our State's character. Making a priority of managing and preserving our cultural heritage makes Vermont a National leader in this field.

Of course, many of these historic structures do not meet modern fire prevention codes and lack basic features such as sprinklers, which can drastically reduce the potential for irreparable damage from a fire. Today I am reintroducing the Historic Downtown Preservation and Access Act, a bill that would create a refundable tax credit for the installation of fire suppression systems and elevators in older, multi-use buildings in historic downtowns. Every year, fires destroy numerous historic buildings that often serve as the center of towns and villages across the nation. In 2011, the Brooks House in Brattleboro, Vermont, burned down after almost 150 years in use as a hotel and later, as a multi-use building for residential housing and commercial space. After six years of rebuilding and restoring, those who were displaced by this fire are finally getting back on their feet.

The Historic Downtown Preservation and Access Act will establish a 50 percent refundable tax credit of up to $50,000 that incentivizes the installation of sprinkler systems in order to help prevent and minimize damage caused by fire, including potential loss of life, extensive property damage, and, in some instances, federal funding that is reinvested during the restoration process. This bill also includes a provision to encourage the installation of elevators in our historic buildings, making them accessible to all. This would ensure that upper floors for commercial or residential use are accessible to everyone, including tenants and their guests. Finally, this bill is updated to establish a tax credit for the costs incurred when removing hazardous substances from historic buildings, like lead paint, asbestos, and radon.

We should encourage the maintenance of the history and character of historic buildings and downtowns, while also ensuring that they remain safe and accessible to all. This bill is a responsible step forward in those efforts. As we look ahead to comprehensive tax reform, I hope that Congress will consider commonsense legislation like this that will help preserve our towns' unique histories and legacy features for decades to come, while promoting the safety of all Americans.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility to receive refundable tax credits for coverage under a qualified health plan; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Affordable Health Insurance for the Middle Class Act, a common sense fix to improve affordability of health insurance on the individual market. I am pleased that Senators HASSAN, WARREN, HARRIS, BALDWIN, and LEAHY have joined this bill as original cosponsors, and I appreciate their support.

Since its implementation, the Affordable Care Act has helped to expand health care and control out-of-pocket costs for millions of Americans. Over 20 million people who were previously uninsured now have coverage, there are no yearly or lifetime limits on coverage, and no one can be denied coverage or charged more based on their gender or because of a pre-existing health condition. The Affordable Care Act also expanded the individual marketplace, through which 18 million people currently get their coverage. Individuals who make between 100 and 400 percent of the federal poverty level, and who do not have affordable employer coverage available to them, can receive a tax credit subsidy to help pay for insurance on the individual market. This credit limits the cost of insurance at 9.69 percent of an individual's income.

However, someone who makes just one dollar above the income threshold immediately loses all federal assistance. This 'cliff' unfairly impacts middle-income Americans who are by no means wealthy, but who make just barely too much to qualify for the tax credit. I am particularly concerned about my constituents between the ages of 50 to 64, who are facing higher premiums as they age and who need access to health services but are not yet eligible for Medicare.

To address this issue, the Affordable Health Insurance for the Middle Class Act would eliminate the current cliff, and instead gradually phase out federal assistance based on income. Nobody would pay more than 9.69 percent of their income for insurance, and once someone's premium fell below this threshold, they would no longer receive federal assistance.

For example, in my hometown of San Francisco, a 60-year-old making $50,000 currently pays $946 per month for the second-lowest cost Silver plan and does not receive federal assistance. Under this bill, their premium would be capped at $404, or 9.69 percent of their income, and the tax credit subsidy would cover the rest. This bill would create a fairer and more predictable system, ensuring that consumers on the individual market know just how much their insurance will cost and will have affordable options available. The Affordable Care Act has reduced costs and expanded benefits for many Americans, and it is critical that we build on this progress to further improve the law—not destroy it.

The bill is supported by a number of organizations, including the American Association of Neurological Surgeons, AANS, Child Welfare League of America, Congress of Neurological Surgeons, CNS, Families USA, Lung Cancer Alliance, and National Farmers Union.

This legislation is a simple fix that provides relief for middle-income

Americans and strengthens affordability protections for coverage through the individual market. I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor the Affordable Health Insurance for the Middle Class Act. Thank you Mr. President and I yield the floor.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1308. A bill to increase authorized funding for the Soo Locks; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about legislation I am introducing with my colleague from Michigan Senator STABENOW to authorize funding for a new Soo Lock.

Since 1855, locks at the St. Mary's River have allowed ships to pass between Lake Superior and Lake Huron. In modern times, this waterway has allowed large freighters to move coal, iron ore, and agricultural products throughout the Great Lakes. The Soo Locks are the most important link in a critical supply chain that connects iron ore mines in Minnesota and Michigan's Upper Peninsula with steel mills and manufacturing facilities all across the country.

During World War II, Congress authorized funding for a new lock because it was clear the country's ability to move iron ore to steel plants in Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania was absolutely critical for the war effort. It took less than 2 years to complete that project after Congress authorized the funding in 1942.

President Roosevelt signed an Executive order establishing the military district of Sault Saint Marie, and the Army stationed 10,000 troops there to defend the Soo Locks by land, air, and sea—so great was the fear that a German attack would instantly cripple Allied efforts to produce steel and weapons.

Today, there is only one Soo Lock—the Poe Lock—that is large enough to accommodate modern freighters, especially the 1,000-foot-long vessels that move millions of tons of iron ore each and every year. Over 80 percent of the commodities that flow through the Soo Locks must pass through the Poe Lock, and each one of those 1,000-foot freighters carries the equivalent of 3,000 truckloads of commodities. It is not possible to move that amount of iron ore in these 1,000-foot freighters by rail or by road, and on top of that, the steel mills are only equipped to handle the iron ore supply by water.

A study conducted by the Department of Homeland Security in 2015 confirmed that it is the Achilles' heel of our economy. Key findings from the Department say: ''A disruption of the Poe Lock likely will cause an almost complete shutdown of Great Lake steel production.''

The report goes on to say: ''A shutdown of Great Lakes steel production likely will cause almost all North American appliances, automobiles, construction equipment, farm equipment, mining equipment, and railcar production to cease within weeks.''

Within weeks. The Homeland Security report estimates that 11 million Americans would lose their jobs if this were to happen.

Consider the fact that the jobs of millions of American workers depend on the ability of large ships to pass, as depicted, from here to here on the St. Mary's Falls Canal. Currently, there is only one lock that can accommodate this task. If this lock shuts down, steel plants in Ohio and Indiana and Kentucky shut down. Auto plants in Texas, Tennessee, California, and Michigan shut down. The American economy shuts down. The losses would be felt throughout the United States, wherever steel is used in the manufacturing process.

We are taking an unacceptable risk if we do not act swiftly to ensure that there is a backup in the case of a lock failure. That is why I am joining Senator STABENOW and members of the Michigan congressional delegation from both parties to introduce a bill that would authorize the funding for constructing another larger Poe-sized lock. The current authorization for the project is far below projected cost estimates. Our bill, which was introduced today, if enacted, will allow the Army Corps to move directly into the design and construction phase. We do not have a moment to lose.

Just last week, I traveled to the Soo Locks for a tour with members of the Michigan congressional delegation, and we saw firsthand how the dedicated men and women of the Army Corps are working to keep the locks functioning. They go to work each and every day with a full understanding of how the safety and security of the Nation rests with their ability to maintain this critical infrastructure. It is a credit to the skill of the Army Corps of Engineers that freighters have been able to pass through the St. Mary's on their journeys around the Great Lakes almost without interruption. But they are working with equipment that has been maintained well beyond its life cycle and in some cases beyond two life cycles. When I was there last week, I saw 100-year-old water pumps still in use.

We cannot continue to rely on the infrastructure investments made by our grandparents and great-grandparents. It is time to invest in our country and the well-being of our economy for future generations and pass the Soo Locks Modernization Act.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1311. A bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1311

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Preserving Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund.
Sec. 3. Mandatory restitution for victims of commercial sexual exploitation.
Sec. 4. Victim-witness assistance in sexual exploitation cases.
Sec. 5. Victim protection training for the Department of Homeland Security.
Sec. 6. Implementing a victim-centered approach to human trafficking.
Sec. 7. Direct services for child victims of human trafficking.
Sec. 8. Holistic training for Federal law enforcement officers and prosecutors.
Sec. 9. Best practices in delivering justice for victims of trafficking.
Sec. 10. Training for health professionals.
Sec. 11. Improving the national strategy to combat human trafficking.
Sec. 12. Specialized human trafficking training and technical assistance for service providers.
Sec. 13. Enhanced penalties for human trafficking, child exploitation, and repeat offenders.
Sec. 14. Targeting organized human trafficking perpetrators.
Sec. 15. Investigating complex human trafficking networks.
Sec. 16. Combating sex tourism.
Sec. 17. Human Trafficking Justice Coordinators.
Sec. 18. Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Human Trafficking.
Sec. 19. Additional reporting on crime.
Sec. 20. Making the Presidential Survivor Council permanent.
Sec. 21. Strengthening the National Human Trafficking Hotline.
Sec. 22. Ending government partnerships with the commercial sex industry.
Sec. 23. Study of human trafficking victim privilege.
Sec. 24. Understanding the effects of severe forms of trafficking in persons.
Sec. 25. Combating trafficking in persons.
Sec. 26. Grant accountability.

SEC. 2. PRESERVING DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund established under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code—

(1) is intended to supplement, and not supplant, any other funding for domestic trafficking victims; and

(2) has achieved the objective described in paragraph (1) since the establishment of the Fund.

(b) ENSURING FULL FUNDING.—Section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''September 30, 2023'';

(2) in subsection (f), by inserting '', including the mandatory imposition of civil remedies for satisfaction of an unpaid fine as authorized under section 3613, where appropriate'' after ''criminal cases''; and

(3) in subsection (h)(3), by inserting ''and child victims of a severe form of trafficking (as defined in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102))'' after ''child pornography victims''.

SEC. 3. MANDATORY RESTITUTION FOR VICTIMS OF COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 117 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 2429. Mandatory restitution

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3663 or 3663A, and in addition to any other civil or criminal penalty authorized by law, the court shall order restitution for any offense under this chapter.

''(b) SCOPE AND NATURE OF ORDER.—

''(1) DIRECTIONS.—An order of restitution under this section shall direct the defendant to pay the victim (through the appropriate court mechanism) the full amount of the victim's losses, as determined by the court under paragraph (3).

''(2) ENFORCEMENT.—An order of restitution under this section shall be issued and enforced in accordance with section 3664 in the same manner as an order under section 3663A.

''(3) FULL AMOUNT OF THE VICTIM'S LOSSES DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'full amount of the victim's losses'—

''(A) has the meaning given the term in section 2259(b)(3); and

''(B) includes the gross income or value to the defendant of the victim's services, if the services constitute commercial sex acts as defined under section 1591.

''(4) FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY.—The forfeiture of property under this subsection shall be governed by the provisions of section 413 (other than subsection (d) of such section 413) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853).

''(c) VICTIM DEFINED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term 'victim' means the individual harmed as a result of the commission of a crime under this chapter.

''(2) ASSUMPTION OF CRIME VICTIM'S RIGHTS.—In the case of a victim who is under 18 years of age, incompetent, incapacitated, or deceased, the legal guardian of the victim, a representative of the victim's estate, or any other person appointed as suitable by the court may assume the crime victim's rights under this section

''(d) PROHIBITION.—A defendant charged with an offense under this chapter may not be named as a representative or guardian of a victim of the offense.''.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 117 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2428 the following:

''2429. Mandatory restitution.''.

SEC. 4. VICTIM-WITNESS ASSISTANCE IN SEXUAL EXPLOITATION CASES.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF DOJ APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 524(c)(1)(B) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', chapter 110 of title 18'' after ''chapter 77 of title 18''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 31.—Section 9705(a)(2)(B)(v) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', chapter 109A of title 18 (relating to sexual abuse), chapter 110 of title 18 (relating to child sexual exploitation), or chapter 117 of title 18 (relating to transportation for illegal sexual activity and related crimes)'' after ''(relating to human trafficking)''.

SEC. 5. VICTIM PROTECTION TRAINING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title IX of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 641 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 906. VICTIM PROTECTION TRAINING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

''(a) DIRECTIVE TO DHS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS AND TASK FORCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue a directive to—

''(A) all Federal law enforcement officers and relevant personnel employed by the Department who may be involved in the investigation of human trafficking offenses; and

''(B) members of all task forces led by the Department that participate in the investigation of human trafficking offenses.

''(2) REQUIRED INSTRUCTIONS.—The directive required to be issued under paragraph (1) shall include instructions on—

''(A) the investigation of individuals who patronize or solicit human trafficking victims as being engaged in severe trafficking in persons and how such individuals should be investigated for their roles in severe trafficking in persons; and

''(B) how victims of sex or labor trafficking often engage in criminal acts as a direct result of severe trafficking in persons and such individuals are victims of a crime and affirmative measures should be taken to avoid arresting, charging, or prosecuting such individuals for any offense that is the direct result of their victimization.

''(b) VICTIM SCREENING PROTOCOL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue a screening protocol for use during all anti-trafficking law enforcement operations in which the Department is involved.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The protocol required to be issued under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) require the individual screening of all adults and children who are suspected of engaging in commercial sex acts, child labor that is a violation of law, or work in violation of labor standards to determine whether each individual screened is a victim of human trafficking;

''(B) require affirmative measures to avoid arresting, charging, or prosecuting human trafficking victims for any offense that is the direct result of their victimization;

''(C) be developed in consultation with relevant interagency partners and nongovernmental organizations that specialize in the prevention of human trafficking or in the identification and support of victims of human trafficking and survivors of human trafficking; and

''(D) include—

''(i) procedures and practices to ensure that the screening process minimizes trauma or revictimization of the person being screened; and

''(ii) guidelines on assisting victims of human trafficking in identifying and receiving restorative services.

''(c) MANDATORY TRAINING.—The training described in sections 902 and 904 shall include training necessary to implement—

''(1) the directive required under subsection (a); and

''(2) the protocol required under subsection (b).''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129 Stat. 227) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 905 the following:

''Sec. 906. Victim protection training for the Department of Homeland Security.''.

SEC. 6. IMPLEMENTING A VICTIM-CENTERED APPROACH TO HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(2) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii); by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) PRIORITY.—In selecting recipients of grants under this paragraph that are only available for law enforcement operations or task forces, the Attorney General may give priority to any applicant that files an attestation with the Attorney General stating that—

''(i) the grant funds—

''(I) will be used to assist in the prevention of severe forms of trafficking in persons in accordance with Federal law;

''(II) will be used to strengthen efforts to investigate and prosecute those who knowingly benefit financially from participation in a venture that has engaged in any act of human trafficking;

''(III) will be used to take affirmative measures to avoid arresting, charging, or prosecuting victims of human trafficking for any offense that is the direct result of their victimization; and

''(IV) will not be used to require a victim of human trafficking to collaborate with law enforcement officers as a condition of access to any shelter or restorative services; and

''(ii) the applicant will provide dedicated resources for anti-human trafficking law enforcement for a period that is longer than the duration of the grant received under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 7. DIRECT SERVICES FOR CHILD VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)) is amended—

(1) in the heading by inserting ''CHILD VICTIMS OF A SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS AND'' before ''VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY''; and

(2) by inserting ''victims of a severe form of trafficking (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(A)) who were under the age of 18 at the time of the offense and'' before ''victims of child pornography''.

SEC. 8. HOLISTIC TRAINING FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND PROSECUTORS.

All training required under the Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015 (42 U.S.C. 14044g) and section 105(c)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(4)) shall—

(1) emphasize that an individual who knowingly solicits or patronizes a commercial sex act from a person who was a minor (consistent with section 1591(c) of title 18, United States Code) or was subject to force, fraud, or coercion is guilty of an offense under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, and is a party to a human trafficking offense;

(2) develop specific curriculum for—

(A) under appropriate circumstances, arresting and prosecuting buyers of commercial sex, child labor that is a violation of law, or forced labor as a form of primary prevention; and

(B) investigating and prosecuting individuals who knowingly benefit financially from participation in a venture that has engaged in any act of human trafficking; and

(3) specify that any comprehensive approach to eliminating human trafficking

shall include a demand reduction component.

SEC. 9. BEST PRACTICES IN DELIVERING JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall issue guidance to all offices and components of the Department of Justice—

(1) emphasizing that an individual who knowingly solicits or patronizes a commercial sex act from a person who was a minor (consistent with section 1591(c) of title 18, United States Code) or was subject to force, fraud, or coercion is guilty of an offense under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, and is a party to a severe form of trafficking in persons, as that term is defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9));

(2) recommending and implementing best practices for the collection of special assessments under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 101 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129 Stat. 228), including a directive that civil liens are an authorized collection method and remedy under section 3613 of title 18, United States Code; and

(3) clarifying that commercial sexual exploitation is a form of gender-based violence.

SEC. 10. TRAINING FOR HEALTH PROFESSIONALS.

Section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) TRAINING FOR HEALTH PROFESSIONALS.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'pilot program' means the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program established under paragraph (2); and

''(B) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

''(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may continue a pilot program, which shall be known as the 'Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program' or the 'SOAR to Health and Wellness Training pilot program'.

''(B) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—Under the pilot program, the Secretary may award grants to appropriate entities to train health care providers—

''(i) to identify potential human trafficking victims;

''(ii) to work with law enforcement agencies to report human trafficking and facilitate communication with human trafficking victims, in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, local, and tribal laws, including legal confidentiality requirements for patients and health care providers;

''(iii) to refer such victims to appropriate social or victims service agencies or organizations;

''(iv) to provide such victims with appropriate patient-centered, evidence-based care; and

''(v) to foster the practice of interprofessional collaboration, including practices used by organizations other than health care organizations.

''(C) FUNCTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The functions of the pilot program shall include, as appropriate, the functions of the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training program that was operating on the day before the date of the enactment of this subsection and any of the authorized initiatives described in clause (ii).

''(ii) AUTHORIZED INITIATIVES.—The authorized initiatives of the pilot program shall include—

''(I) engaging stakeholders, including victims of human trafficking and Federal, State, local, or tribal partners;

''(II) making grants available to support training in health care sites that represent diversity in—

''(aa) geography;

''(bb) the demographics of the population served;

''(cc) the predominate types of human trafficking cases; and

''(dd) health care provider profiles; and

''(III) providing technical assistance to assist grantees in—

''(aa) achieving the objectives described in subparagraph (B); and

''(bb) reporting on any best practices they identify.

''(D) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate not later than October 1, 2022.

''(3) DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) DATA COLLECTION.—During any of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022 in which the Secretary carries out any of the authorized initiatives described in paragraph (2)(C), the Secretary shall collect data and report on—

''(i) the total number of entities that received a grant under this subsection—

''(I) during the previous fiscal year;

''(II) between the previous fiscal year and the date of the enactment of this subsection; and

''(III) between the date of the enactment of this subsection and the date of the establishment of the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training program that was operating on the day before the date of the enactment of this subsection; and

''(ii) the total number of health care providers and other related providers that participated in training supported by the pilot program—

''(I) during the previous fiscal year;

''(II) between the previous fiscal year and the date of the enactment of this subsection; and

''(III) between the date of the enactment of this subsection and the date of the establishment of the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training program that was operating on the day before the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(B) REPORTING.—Not later than 90 days after the first day of each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report on the data collected under subparagraph (A).

''(C) SHARING BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall make available, on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services, a description of the evidence-based practices and procedures used by entities that receive a grant under the pilot program for carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2)(B).''.

SEC. 11. IMPROVING THE NATIONAL STRATEGY TO COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 606(b) of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (42 U.S.C. 14044h(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) A national strategy to prevent human trafficking and reduce demand for human trafficking victims.''.

SEC. 12. SPECIALIZED HUMAN TRAFFICKING TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044f) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''**LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS**'' and inserting ''**SPECIALIZED HUMAN TRAFFICKING TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''means a State or a local government.'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(A) a State or unit of local government;

''(B) a federally recognized Indian tribal government, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior;

''(C) a victim service provider;

''(D) a nonprofit or for-profit organization (including a tribal nonprofit or for-profit organization);

''(E) a national organization; or

''(F) an institution of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education).'';

(3) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may award grants to eligible entities to—

''(1) provide training to identify and protect victims of trafficking;

''(2) improve quality and quantity of services offered to trafficking survivors; and

''(3) improve victim service providers' partnerships with Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies and other relevant entities.''; and

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) provide technical assistance on the range of services available to victim service providers who serve trafficking victims;

''(5) develop and distribute materials, including materials identifying best practices in accordance with Federal law and policies, to support victim service providers working with human trafficking victims;

''(6) identify and disseminate other publically available materials in accordance with Federal law to help build capacity of service providers;

''(7) provide training at relevant conferences, through webinars, or through other mechanisms in accordance with Federal law; or

''(8) assist service providers in developing additional resources such as partnerships with Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies and other relevant entities in order to access a range of available services in accordance with Federal law.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 2960) is amended by striking the item relating to section 111 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 111. Grants for specialized human trafficking training and technical assistance for service providers.''.

SEC. 13. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKING, CHILD EXPLOITATION, AND REPEAT OFFENDERS.

Part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in chapter 77—

(A) in section 1583(a), in the flush text following paragraph (3), by striking ''not more than 20 years'' and inserting ''not more than 30 years'';

(B) in section 1587, by striking ''four years'' and inserting ''10 years''; and

(C) in section 1591(d), by striking ''20 years'' and inserting ''25 years''; and

(2) in section 2426—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''twice'' and inserting ''3 times''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(B) by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (A)''.

SEC. 14. TARGETING ORGANIZED HUMAN TRAFFICKING PERPETRATORS.

Section 521(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) a Federal offense involving human trafficking, sexual abuse, sexual exploitation, or transportation for prostitution or any illegal sexual activity; and''; and

(4) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking ''(1) or (2)'' and inserting ''(1), (2), or (3)''.

SEC. 15. INVESTIGATING COMPLEX HUMAN TRAFFICKING NETWORKS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(c)—

(A) by inserting ''section 1582 (vessels for slave trade), section 1583 (enticement into slavery),'' after ''section 1581 (peonage),''; and

(B) by inserting ''section 1585 (seizure, detention, transportation or sale of slaves), section 1586 (service on vessels in slave trade), section 1587 (possession of slaves aboard vessel), section 1588 (transportation of slaves from United States),'' after ''section 1584 (involuntary servitude),''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''kidnapping human'' and inserting ''kidnapping, human''; and

(B) by striking ''production, ,'' and inserting ''production, prostitution,''.

SEC. 16. COMBATING SEX TOURISM.

Section 2423 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''for the purpose'' and inserting ''with a motivating purpose''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''for the purpose of engaging'' and inserting ''with a motivating purpose of engaging''.

SEC. 17. HUMAN TRAFFICKING JUSTICE COORDINATORS.

(a) HUMAN TRAFFICKING JUSTICE COORDINATORS.—The Attorney General shall designate in each Federal judicial district not less than 1 Assistant United States Attorney to serve as the Human Trafficking Coordinator for the district who, in addition to any other responsibilities, works with a human trafficking victim-witness specialist and shall be responsible for—

(1) serving as the legal counsel for the Federal judicial district on matters relating to human trafficking;

(2) prosecuting, or assisting in the prosecution of, human trafficking cases;

(3) conducting public outreach and awareness activities relating to human trafficking;

(4) ensuring the collection of data required to be collected under clause (viii) of section 105(d)(7)(Q) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)(Q)), as added by section 18 of this Act;

(5) coordinating with other Federal agencies, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies, victim service providers, and other relevant non-governmental organizations to build partnerships on activities relating to human trafficking; and

(6) ensuring the collection of restitution for victims as required to be ordered under section 1593 of title 18, United States Code, and section 2429 of such title, as added by section 3 of this Act.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE COORDINATOR.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate an official who shall coordinate human trafficking efforts within the Department of Justice who, in addition to any other responsibilities, shall be responsible for—

(1) coordinating, promoting, and supporting the work of the Department of Justice relating to human trafficking, including investigation, prosecution, training, outreach, victim support, grant-making, and policy activities;

(2) in consultation with survivors of human trafficking, compiling, conducting, and disseminating, including making publicly available when appropriate, replication guides and training materials for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, emergency responders, individuals working in victim services, adult and child protective services, social services, and public safety, medical personnel, mental health personnel, financial services personnel, and any other individuals whose work may bring them in contact with human trafficking regarding how to—

(A) conduct investigations in human trafficking cases;

(B) address evidentiary issues and other legal issues; and

(C) appropriately assess, respond to, and interact with victims and witnesses in human trafficking cases, including in administrative, civil, and criminal judicial proceedings; and

(3) carrying out such other duties as the Attorney General determines necessary in connection with enhancing the understanding, prevention, and detection of, and response to, human trafficking.

SEC. 18. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 105(d)(7)(Q) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)(Q)) is amended—

(1) in clause (vi), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(viii) the number of convictions obtained under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, aggregated separately by the form of offense committed with respect to the victim, including recruiting, enticing, harboring, transporting, providing, obtaining, advertising, maintaining, patronizing, or soliciting a human trafficking victim; and''.

SEC. 19. ADDITIONAL REPORTING ON CRIME.

Section 237(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (28 U.S.C. 534 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) incidents of assisting or promoting prostitution, child labor that is a violation of law, or forced labor of an individual under the age of 18 as described in paragraph (1); and

''(5) incidents of purchasing or soliciting commercial sex acts, child labor that is a violation of law, or forced labor with an individual under the age of 18 as described in paragraph (2).''.

SEC. 20. MAKING THE PRESIDENTIAL SURVIVOR COUNCIL PERMANENT.

Section 115 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129 Stat. 243) is amended by striking subsection (h).

SEC. 21. STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.

(a) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 105(d)(3) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and providing an annual report on the case referrals received from the national human trafficking hotline by Federal departments and agencies'' after ''international trafficking''; and

(2) by inserting ''and reporting requirements'' after ''Any data collection procedures''.

(b) HOTLINE INFORMATION.—Section 107(b)(1)(B)(ii) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The number of the national human trafficking hotline described in this clause shall be posted in a visible place in all Federal buildings.''.

SEC. 22. ENDING GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE COMMERCIAL SEX INDUSTRY.

No Federal funds or resources may be used for the operation of, participation in, or partnership with any program that involves the provision of funding or resources to an organization that—

(1) has the primary purpose of providing adult entertainment; and

(2) derives profits from the commercial sex trade.

SEC. 23. STUDY OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING VICTIM PRIVILEGE.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the necessity and desirability of amending the Federal Rules of Evidence to establish a Federal evidentiary privilege for confidential communications between a victim of human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim of human trafficking is a party to a legal action, and a caseworker assisting the victim of human trafficking; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 24. UNDERSTANDING THE EFFECTS OF SEVERE FORMS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129 Stat. 258) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 607. UNDERSTANDING THE PHYSICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF SEVERE FORMS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall jointly conduct a study on the short-term and long-term physical and psychological effects of serious harm (as that term is defined in section 1589(c)(2) and section 1591(e)(4) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-457; 122 Stat. 5044)) in order to determine the most effective types of services for individuals who are identified as victims of these crimes, including victims in cases that were not investigated or prosecuted by any law enforcement agency, and how new or current treatment and programming options should be tailored to address the unique needs and barriers associated with these victims.

''(b) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017, the National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall make available to the public the results, including any associated recommendations, of the study conducted under subsection (a).''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129 Stat. 227) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 606 the following:

''Sec. 607. Understanding the physical and psychological effects of severe forms of trafficking in persons.''.

SEC. 25. COMBATING TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

(a) TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PREVENTION ACT OF 2000 PROGRAMS.—Section 113 of the Trafficking Victims Prevention Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7110) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2014 through 2017'' and inserting ''2018 through 2022.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2014 through 2017'' and inserting ''2018 through 2022''; and

(2) in subsection (i), by striking ''2014 through 2017'' and inserting ''2018 through 2022''.

(b) REINSTATEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION OF GRANTS TO COMBAT CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.—

(1) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED PROVISION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 202 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a) is amended to read as such section read on March 6, 2017.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1241(b) of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (42 U.S.C. 14004a note) is repealed.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as though enacted on March 6, 2017.

(3) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 202(i) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended to read as follows:

''(i) FUNDING.—For each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022, the Attorney General is authorized to allocate up to $8,000,000 of the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 113(d)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Prevention Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7110(d)(1)) to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 26. GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''covered agency'' means an agency authorized to award grants under this Act;

(2) the term ''covered grant'' means a grant authorized to be awarded under this Act; and

(3) the term ''covered official'' means the head of a covered agency.

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All covered grants shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ''unresolved audit finding'' means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of a covered agency that the audited grantee has utilized funds under a covered grant for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of a covered agency shall conduct audits of recipients of covered grants to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of funds under a covered grant that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive funds under a covered grant during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding covered grants, a covered official shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for the covered grant.

(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded funds under a covered grant during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving covered grants under subparagraph (C), a covered official shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the recipient of the covered grant that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and each covered grant program, the term ''nonprofit organization'' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) PROHIBITION.—A covered grant may not be awarded to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a covered grant and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the applicable covered official, in the application for the covered grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, a covered official shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts made available to a covered agency to carry out a covered grant program may be used by a covered official, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under a covered grant program, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in funds made available by the covered agency, unless the covered official provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

(C) REPORT.—

(i) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the appropriate committees of Congress on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

(ii) DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an annual report on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

(iii) DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an annual report on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, each covered official shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an annual certification—

(A) indicating whether—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General of the applicable covered agency under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate official;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(B) that includes a list of any recipients of a covered grant excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(c) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before a covered official awards a covered grant, the covered official shall compare potential awards under the covered grant program with other covered grants awarded to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

(2) REPORT.—If a covered official awards duplicate covered grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the covered official shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes—

(A) a list of all duplicate covered grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate covered grants awarded; and

(B) the reason the covered official awarded the duplicate covered grants.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1312. A bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this week, I am introducing a bill known as the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017. I want to thank Senators FEINSTEIN, CORNYN, KLOBUCHAR, CORKER and RUBIO for joining as original cosponsors. I also want to thank the many organizations that support this bill and worked so closely with us on its development; they include Rights4Girls, Polaris, the ATEST Coalition, Shared Hope International, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators, and the National District Attorneys Association.

As its title implies, our legislation is aimed at combating the terrible scourge of human trafficking in the United States. To call trafficking victims' suffering a grave violation of our most basic human rights would be an understatement. Trafficking is a life-shattering crime that too-often goes unnoticed, despite the profound injury it inflicts on its victims and our society. Traffickers typically operate in the shadows, making it hard to identify them as well as their victims. That invisibility makes it harder still to rescue the victims and bring the perpetrators to justice.

But there are some things we do know about human trafficking, and we know them with some certainty. We know, for example, that trafficking is happening in rural areas, in cities, and in the suburbs. It is not confined to any

one area, because it has become so profitable. It has become a problem of national significance.

To be sure, we have made some strides in combating this terrible crime since the passage of the original Trafficking Victims Protection Act, or TVPA, over 15 years ago. The TVPA, last reauthorized in 2013, authorizes some very important programs to help victims. The bill I'm introducing this week updates and extends a number of these programs, which are under the jurisdiction of the Departments of Justice and Labor. Senator CORNYN this week is introducing a complementary bill that would reauthorize other TVPA programs, including those at the Departments of Health and Homeland Security.

This is not the first time we have collaborated on this subject. Two years ago, Senator CORNYN sponsored, and I cosponsored, another important measure, known as the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. As chair of the Judiciary Committee, I made that 2015 law's passage a top priority for our Committee and fought for its enactment. It established a new fund to help cover survivors' services and also equipped law enforcement with new tools to fight traffickers. The services authorized under this 2015 statute are crucial to helping survivors rebuild their lives with dignity.

The bill that I am introducing this week is a critical next step in ensuring that human trafficking is prevented, its perpetrators prosecuted, and its victims protected. This bill, drafted with bipartisan support, would require more training for investigative personnel at the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security. It also extends a grant program by which school personnel can receive training to recognize and respond to signs of trafficking in our educational system.

This bill also offers increased assistance to prosecutors and law enforcement agencies in their fight against human trafficking. For instance, it authorizes the Secret Service to offer investigative and forensic assistance to other crime fighting agencies. And it updates key provisions of the Missing Children's Assistance Act, which authorizes the important work of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The Center operates a cyber tipline by which internet service providers can report child sexual abuse.

Additionally, the bill I am introducing signals Congress' continued support for services available to trafficking victims who cooperate with federal law enforcement in trafficking investigations. Specifically, the bill authorizes an Office of Victim Assistance within the Department of Homeland Security. This office, which is staffed with specially trained victim assistance personnel, plays a crucial role in securing victims' cooperation with trafficking investigations.

Finally, this bill would promote the collection of more data on trafficking, and it would promote increased coordination among the federal agencies engaged in combating this crime. Meaningful partnerships at the federal level can help expand awareness, leverage expertise, and facilitate creative solutions.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator GRASSLEY in introducing the Trafficking Victims' Protection Act of 2017.

Last week, I met with a remarkable group of anti-trafficking stakeholders in Fresno, California, who reinforced what I have long held to be true: stamping out the horrific crime of human trafficking must be among our top priorities as lawmakers. At our meeting, Central Valley law enforcement, service providers and, most importantly, survivors of human trafficking educated me about the nature and prevalence of sex and labor trafficking in the Central Valley. I learned that counties like Fresno and Tulare serve as key stops along major California trafficking circuits, with victims as young as 10-years-old being shipped to Los Angeles, Las Vegas and beyond. I also learned that in 2016 alone, Fresno Police arrested more than 140 sex buyers and traffickers. This tells me that the demand for trafficking is far too high. Central Valley law enforcement and service providers are working together to reduce this demand, crack down on traffickers, and better serve victims, through a unique, highly-coordinated and victim-centered approach that I believe ought to be emulated nationwide.

Over the past seven years they have teamed up to identify and critically to provide comprehensive services to nearly 500 trafficking victims. When Central Valley law enforcement took down a trafficking ring last year, the ring leader and two of his associates were arrested and prosecuted, and approximately 50 victims were rescued, including 23 children. These victims were all provided with wraparound services, and the ring leader was sentenced to 40 years in prison. This is the kind of coordinated, victim centered work we need to support and replicate nationwide. The Trafficking Victims' Protection Act of 2017 aims to do that.

I have now met with law enforcement, service providers and survivors representing Southern, Central and Northern California. All have made one thing abundantly clear: lawmakers at all levels of government must commit whatever time and resources are needed to thwart this horrendous crime.

Over the past two decades, Congress has taken action to combat human trafficking. We passed the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 and, 8 years later, passed the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act. And two years ago, Congress passed the Justice for Victims of Human Trafficking Act—a landmark piece of legislation. The law focuses on reducing demand, rescuing victims, educating law enforcement and judges, and making sure that trafficking enterprises are put out of business. But it is clear that our work is far from done. The human trafficking industry continues to be one of the biggest criminal enterprises in the world and it is constantly evolving. The use of the internet to sell children for sex has escalated dramatically over the past several years.

In my home State, District Attorney Nancy O'Malley and her pioneering anti-trafficking team identified 47,719 internet users looking to purchase sex in Alameda County alone during a single month. Many of the victims posted on these sites are underage. In one survivor study, a staggering 75% of minor sex trafficking victims reported being bought or sold online. And last year, the Washington Post reported devastating accounts about human trafficking is also committed by Islamic State fighters, who sell young girls over platforms such as Facebook.

The bill that Senator GRASSLEY and I have introduced includes a provision that would give to law enforcement an additional tool to prevent human traffickers from accessing the internet and other tech platforms to sell minors for commercial sex. Under current current law, it is a criminal offense to advertise commercial sex acts with a minor. This legislation would add civil injunction authority to the criminal provision, providing the Department of Justice with a more readily accessible tool to deny human traffickers access to tech platforms to commit trafficking crimes. The bill also supports and strengthens efforts to prevent, detect, and respond to human trafficking crimes.

It allows school resource officers at schools to train school personnel to recognize and respond to signs of child sex trafficking. This is important because kids are often recruited at schools. In one heartbreaking case in Oakland, California, a 12-year-old student with top grades suddenly changed her normal behavior. She stopped completing her assignments, became withdrawn, and began wearing provocative clothing. Eventually, she stopped going to school altogether. Her parents contacted the school looking for her, but no one was able to locate her. She was discovered 24 hours later on an online sex advertisement based out of Los Angeles. This 12-year-old girl had been groomed by a trafficker—but no one was able to recognize the signs of exploitation. Teachers and school personnel interact with these kids every day. They are critical in recognizing which kids are at risk or are about to become exploited. We need to be sure that they are familiar with the patterns and practices of human traffickers, and know how to identify and respond to suspected victims.

In addition to working with Chairman GRASSLEY on the reauthorization

bill, I am also pleased to cosponsor Senator CORNYN and Senator KLOBUCHAR's Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017. One of the most important provisions of this bill is the mandatory designation of at least one Human Trafficking Justice Coordinator in each United States Attorney's Office. This is critical to ensure that our judicial system treats human trafficking offenses with the seriousness they deserve. Among other responsibilities, this Coordinator will be responsible for assisting in the prosecution of human trafficking cases. This includes the prosecution of those who solicit minors for commercial sex, a change in the law that was enacted in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

In 2015, former United States Attorney Eileen Decker conducted one of the first federal prosecutions of a buyer under this new statute. The buyer, a 59-year-old man from Torrance, admitted to lying to federal prosecutors about his conduct with a 16-year-old girl he met online and hired for commercial sex acts. He was sentenced to 57 months in prison. Former United States Attorney Decker remarked that this case should serve as a warning to adults who engage in this type of criminal conduct.

It is critical that such prosecutions continue. Stemming the abuse and exploitation of trafficking requires confronting not only the predatory suppliers, but also those who solicit young girls for commercial sex. The designation of a Human Trafficking Justice Coordinator would ensure that those who violate human trafficking offenses, both buyers and sellers, are prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. The Human Justice Trafficking Coordinator would also be responsible for ensuring the collection of restitution for victims.

Restitution for trafficking victims is mandatory under federal law. Moreover, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act requires the Justice Department to train prosecutors to seek restitution for trafficking victims, regardless of whether the victim requests restitution. Yet, we continue to see our judicial system failing to do right by victims. In a 2015 law review article, the Human Trafficking Pro Bono Legal Center reported on the appallingly low rates of restitution orders in human trafficking prosecutions. In a study of federal human trafficking cases brought over a four period, federal courts failed to order restitution in nearly two-thirds of cases involving sex trafficking offenses. And shockingly, they found that the victims least likely to obtain restitution orders were children trafficked in the sex industry. Less than one in three defendants who commit sex trafficking offenses against children were ordered to pay restitution to their victims. This is unacceptable.

Furthermore, even if restitution is ordered against a trafficker, restitution itself is not being effectively collected. In response the requests from the Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General included restitution order and collection data in the Department of Justice's report on trafficking for fiscal year 2015. Of the $4,268,358 ordered in restitution in 2015, only $987 was collected.

While we may not expect to see full restitution collected in the year it is ordered, it is shocking that the total restitution collected is less than 1% of what was ordered.

That is why we have tried to include additional restitution provisions in the bill to better support victims. For example, there is an additional provision in the bill to update the Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015, a bill that I authored with Senator PORTMAN. That bill mandated extensive training on restitution for prosecutors and judges. It is our hope that with these updates—and with the recent enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016 to make sure that prosecutors are held accountable in seeking restitution—victims will be better supported going forward. I am hopeful that we will be able to pass these bipartisan bills this Congress. I urge my colleagues in this body to support the passage of this important, comprehensive legislation to protect trafficking victims.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1313. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Louisiana for working with me on the flood insurance bill that we are introducing today. This issue is so important to both of our States because both of our States have experienced enormous levels of flooding every year due to extreme weather.

In New York, after Superstorm Sandy hit our State, millions of homes and businesses were damaged by flooding that occurred. My colleague from Louisiana could go on and on and will tell you about flood damage his own constituents have had to endure, so it should be clear to everyone here that it is not a partisan issue.

Flooding can happen anywhere, in any State, from the Northeast to the gulf coast and everywhere else. Protecting our communities from the devastation that comes from flooding should be one of our highest priorities in this Chamber.

Unfortunately, the National Flood Insurance Program has not been doing its job very well. Too many families who have had their properties damaged in a flood or even destroyed in a flood have paid their flood insurance premiums year after year only to find out there was some loophole that prevented them from getting the coverage they need. We cannot turn our backs and allow this to keep happening.

The bipartisan bill I have written with the Senator from Louisiana would ensure that flood insurance is more affordable for homeowners. It would make sure the Flood Insurance Program is no longer riddled with loopholes that leave our homeowners stranded and fighting with insurance companies on their own, all while trying to recover and rebuild from the flood damage. It would finally give homeowners the peace of mind that flood insurance rates will actually be affordable so that low- and moderate-income homeowners are not priced out of their homes because of extreme rate increases.

Our bill would also fund more projects to protect homes and communities from flood risk in the first place. Our bill would more than double the amount of funding a homeowner can receive for raising the elevation of their home, which is a proven way to protect against floods in certain areas, and it would provide more funding for FEMA's flood mitigation program. Those funds are used by States and local communities to plan and carry out projects that help manage flood risk to homes and other structures.

After Superstorm Sandy hit New York, too many families in my State experienced what amounted to a disaster after that disaster. They encountered engineering fraud. They had to deal with excessive delays and widespread underpayment of claims. This was shameful and totally unacceptable, especially for a program specifically designed to help people in their greatest time of need. So I am particularly pleased that this bill would fix some of the fundamental flaws in the National Flood Insurance Program's claims and appeals process that harmed so many of my constituents.

Our bill would prohibit engineering reports from being altered by anyone other than the person who inspected the home. That was one of the main causes of fraud for many homeowners in my State. It would require FEMA to have more direct oversight over the litigation costs and engineering costs that are billed to the government. It would repeal the onerous earth movement exemption, which too often has been used to deny flood claims to families who desperately need the payments after a flood.

Our bill also would ensure that engineers and insurance companies are not shielded from legal liability when they do commit fraud, which, unfortunately, was much more common than anyone would even think.

The Flood Insurance Program expires on September 30 of this year, and it is absolutely vital that we reauthorize it with strong reforms that protect homeowners. We need to do everything we can to ensure that the Flood Insurance Program is affordable, sustainable, transparent, and accountable. This is our chance to do that now.

This is a good bipartisan bill, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in making these important reforms to the National Flood Insurance Program.

I yield the floor now to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding, as well as for the tremendous work she and our staffs have done together on the Flood Insurance Affordability and Sustainability Act of 2017.

There is a capriciousness of flooding which makes the National Flood Insurance Program so important. You can have a mountaintop village next to a dry gulch. If there is a sudden flash flood, folks who have lived there 100 years suddenly find their 100-year-old homes destroyed. The NFIP helps rebuild the lives of those who are so affected.

The Flood Insurance Program is critical, not just to that mountaintop village but, by extension, our entire country. The economic impact of flooding extends far beyond real estate transactions to the fundamental vitality of communities and the workforce that operates our ports, develops and refines our domestic energy, and produces our seafood and agriculture for global consumption. It just makes sense.

Most towns started on the coast and on riverways because that is how goods were transported, and the history of these waterside communities is what makes them, one, economically vital, but, two, also makes them susceptible to flooding. I will note that the Presiding Officer's State of Pennsylvania, I believe, has among the most incidents of flooding in our country—principally because there are so many riverine systems. There is a valley with a river. If the water rises quickly, that riverside community is flooded. Look at my State of Louisiana. It relies on an accessible and affordable flood insurance program, but that benefits the country.

Louisiana is the No. 1 producer of offshore oil and gas, producing over 15 percent of our Nation's domestic energy supply. That is 15 percent of our Nation's domestic energy supply. It is home to the second largest refining capacity in petrochemical industry. The Gulf of Mexico is home to 11 of the top 20 U.S. ports by cargo volume, and we have one of the largest seafood industries in the world. After Hurricane Katrina, when our port facilities were affected and the farmers in the Upper Missouri suddenly could not get their crop to international markets, it shows the importance of our ports for our entire economy.

The National Flood Insurance Program allows folks in my State to participate in a working coast that gets that energy inland and gets those products in the international market, and this is what provides the value-added contribution to our domestic economy. Since the creation of the National Flood Insurance Program, people in Louisiana paid over $5 billion in flood insurance premiums, but, unfortunately, we have suffered some of the greatest losses after Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustov, Isaac, and the flooding of the great Louisiana floods of last March and August.

While the NFIP has a deficit of $24 billion—according to FEMA's premium and payout data—the NFIP would have had a surplus if we remove the 2005 loss year, including the losses incurred after Superstorm Sandy. I will also note that New Orleans flooded because federally built floodwalls designed to protect those businesses and families were constructed in a faulty way. This has been recognized, and their failure is what led to the expense. I am not here to say that NFIP doesn't need reforms—it needs reforms—but to underscore the fact that the program has worked for many years despite its failings. We need to reauthorize the NFIP and use the opportunity to improve the program, make it more affordable, transferring more risk to the private sector at a lower cost, increase investment mitigation, modernizing flood mapping to produce greater accuracy, and improve the transparency and accountability of all the participants that operate and administer the program.

There are a number of constituencies interested in long-term reauthorization of NFIP. Senator GILLIBRAND and I know that the issue of flooding crosses party and geographical lines. We wanted to set the right bipartisan tone as Congress begins to debate the issue by introducing our bill, the Flood Insurance Affordability and Sustainability Act. We hope the legislation will contribute to the ongoing discussion and work the committees of jurisdiction are conducting as we move toward reauthorization of the NFIP and with the needed reforms that enhance affordability and sustainability of the program.

Senator GILLIBRAND and her staff are passionate advocates for an affordable and sustainable flood insurance program. I am glad to work with her on this issue. We have listened to many stakeholders: bankers, realtors, homebuilders, flood plain managers, insurers, reinsurers, mapping experts, local government officials, financial experts and, most importantly, homeowners who work on our working coast and who have so much invested in making sure they can live and raise their families in a way which has protection from the capriciousness of flooding.

I thank my colleague from New York, as well as Senator CAPITO, for her contribution to this legislation and process.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1314. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to bolster fairness and transparency in consideration of interstate natural gas pipelines, to provide for greater public input opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. Today I am introducing a bipartisan bill to make the process of siting natural gas pipelines fairer and more transparent.

For some time now, I have been listening to Virginians with passionate views on the proposed Atlantic Coast and Mountain Valley Pipelines. For various reasons, many oppose one or both of these projects, while others support these projects. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, is tasked with analyzing all the issues—purpose and need for a project, impacts on 2 'people living on the route, potential risks to the environment or property—and deciding what course best serves the public interest.

From listening to all sides, I have concluded that while reasonable people may reach different conclusions, FERC's public input process is flawed and could be better. Accordingly, this legislation proposes several steps to address several shortcomings, all of which were originally brought to my attention by Virginia constituents. For instance, this bill requires programmatic analysis of pipelines proposed around the same time and in the same geographic vicinity so that the full impacts of multiple projects can be analyzed. It requires a greater number of public comment meetings so that citizens are not required to commute long distances to meetings at which they must speed through just a few minutes of remarks on these complex topics. And it clarifies the circumstances under which eminent domain should and should not be used.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleague Senator MARK WARNER on this bill, and our Virginia Republican colleague Representative MORGAN GRIFFITH is preparing a similar bill in the House of Representatives. While our views may differ on many aspects of energy policy, we can all agree that the public deserves reasonable opportunity to weigh in on energy infrastructure projects and that this process can be fairer and more transparent without mandating a particular outcome.

I encourage the Senate to consider this legislation, not to pave the way for pipelines nor to throw up insurmountable roadblocks to them—but to give the public greater certainty that the federal government's infrastructure decisions are fair and transparent.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 185—RECOGNIZING AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL WATER SAFETY MONTH

Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 185

Whereas, according to the 2016 report of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, there were estimated averages of—

(1) 5,600 pool- or spa-related nonfatal drowning injuries treated at a hospital emergency department during each of the 2013 through 2015 calendar years; and

(2) 367 pool- or spa-related nonfatal or fatal drowning injuries involving children younger than 15 years old during each of the 2011 through 2013 calendar years, with 77 percent of those injuries involving children younger than 5 years old;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, drowning is—

(1) the leading cause of unintentional death in the United States among children 1 through 4 years old; and

(2) the second-leading cause of unintentional death in the United States among children 5 through 14 years old;

Whereas drowning ranks fifth among the leading causes of unintentional injury or death in the United States, and every day, approximately 10 individuals die from unintentional drowning, 2 of whom are children 14 years old or younger;

Whereas the goal of National Water Safety Month is to prevent or reduce the number of unintentional drowning-related injuries and deaths in pools and open water venues;

Whereas the recreational water industry, as represented by the organizations involved in the National Water Safety Month Coalition, has contributed to that goal by—

(1) developing, through codes and standards, safe public swimming facilities and residential pools and spas; and

(2) providing aquatic programs and public awareness relating to unintentional accidents in pools and open water venues;

Whereas unintentional drowning deaths that occur each year, especially of children under 5 years old, can be prevented by teaching children to swim, by using barriers and other devices that aid in preventing access to areas where drowning could occur, and especially by providing constant adult supervision without distraction;

Whereas each public pool and spa in the United States should be in compliance with the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 8001 et seq.), which was signed into law on December 19, 2007, and requires all public pools to install safe drain covers that help prevent entrapment;

Whereas each residential pool and spa in the United States should be built and maintained in accordance with the guidelines described in that Act or the International Swimming Pool and Spa Code, which a State or locality may adopt through building codes and standards;

Whereas ⅔ of drowning deaths occur during May through August; and

Whereas, for the tenth consecutive year, May has been recognized as National Water Safety Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Water Safety Month;

(2) supports promoting awareness of water safety by increasing public education and awareness;

(3) acknowledges the grief of families who have faced the loss of a loved one, and commends the families who, in their grief, choose to promote and educate the public on water safety;

(4) encourages States, localities, and territories of the United States to—

(A) support the goals and ideals of National Water Safety Month by issuing a proclamation to designate May 2017 as ''National Water Safety Month'';

(B) support the adoption of codes and standards that provide safety requirements that may decrease the incidence of drowning; and

(C) engage in and encourage public awareness campaigns, including campaigns that educate individuals on—

(i) how to swim;

(ii) layers of protection; and

(iii) adult supervision;

(5) recognizes the vital role that swimming and aquatic-related activities play in maintaining physical and mental health and enhancing quality of life;

(6) encourages efforts to educate the public about water safety to prevent drownings and recreational water-related injuries; and

(7) understands the vital importance of communicating water safety rules and programs to families and individuals of all ages, including owners of private pools, users of public swimming facilities, and visitors to waterparks.

SENATE RESOLUTION 186—RECOGNIZING THE AVIATION CADET MUSEUM IN EUREKA SPRINGS, ARKANSAS, AS THE NATIONAL AVIATION CADET MUSEUM OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 186

Whereas the Aviation Cadet Museum was founded in 1994 by former aviation cadet and Air Force First Lieutenant Errol Severe;

Whereas, from 1917 until 1965, the flying cadet and succeeding aviation cadet programs served as the primary production source for nearly 500,000 joint service pilots, navigators, and bombardiers;

Whereas the bravery, courage, dedication, and heroism of aviators and supporting ground crews from the Army Air Corps and the Army Air Forces were critical factors in defeating the enemies of the United States during World War I and World War II;

Whereas the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, is the only museum in the United States that exists exclusively to preserve and promote an understanding of the role of aviation cadets in the 20th century; and

Whereas the Aviation Cadet Museum is dedicated to—

(1) celebrating the spirit of the United States; and

(2) recognizing the teamwork, collaboration, patriotism, and courage of the men who trained for and fought in, as well as those individuals on the home front who mobilized and supported, the national aviation effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, as the national aviation cadet museum of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 187—CONGRATULATING AND HONORING FERMI NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LABORATORY ON 50 YEARS OF GROUNDBREAKING DISCOVERIES

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 187

Whereas, in 2017, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (referred to in this preamble as ''Fermilab'') celebrates the 50th anniversary of the date on which the first employees of Fermilab started work in Illinois, June 15, 1967;

Whereas Fermilab drives scientific discovery by building and operating world-leading particle accelerator and detector facilities, performing pioneering research with national and global partners, and developing new technologies for science that support the industrial competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas Fermilab provides research facilities for 4,500 scientists from 50 countries;

Whereas research at Fermilab led to the discovery of the 3 building blocks of the universe, the bottom quark in 1977, the top quark in 1995, and the tau neutrino in 2000;

Whereas superconducting magnets developed at Fermilab led to the advancement of magnetic resonance imaging medical diagnostics;

Whereas Fermilab contributed critical components, computing capabilities, and scientific expertise to the 2012 discovery of the Higgs boson in Geneva, Switzerland;

Whereas Fermilab continues to lead scientific discoveries, including planning construction for the Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility to power the Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment; and

Whereas Fermilab demonstrates its strong commitment to developing a diverse workforce for the future in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics through educational programs that bring more than 15,000 K-12 students to visit Fermilab each year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates and honors the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory on the semicentennial of the Laboratory; and

(2) wishes the Laboratory success in continuing to help the people of the United States understand the mysteries of matter, energy, space, and time.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 220. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 221. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 222. Mr. TILLIS (for Mr. MORAN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 174, recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 220. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 13. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE UNWAVERING COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Following World War II, the United States rejected isolationism, established its role as a world leader, and developed an international alliance system that protected the United States while supporting democracy, freedom, and economic prosperity with European nations.

(2) 70 years ago, the United States announced the Marshall Plan for Europe, a strategic investment in Europe, as well as articulated the Truman Doctrine, which sought to contain a growing Soviet threat in Southern Europe.

(3) In 1949, the United States, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom signed the North Atlantic Treaty that formed the basis of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (in this section referred to as ''NATO'').

(4) NATO was created to protect countries from a growing Soviet threat, promote international peace and stability, and defend freedom.

(5) To date, 29 countries have joined NATO.

(6) For more than 67 years, NATO has served as a central pillar of United States national security and a deterrent against adversaries and external threats.

(7) NATO continues to improve its collective defense measures, enhance its military capabilities to address a full spectrum of complex threats, and partner with non-NATO countries to promote international stability.

(8) Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty is an integral part of NATO and states that ''[t]he Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all . . .''.

(9) NATO invoked Article 5 for the first time less than 24 hours after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks against the United States.

(10) In Afghanistan, NATO allies and partners have served alongside United States forces since 2001, reaching a peak of more than 42,000 ally and partner forces, 6,300 NATO forces continue to serve today alongside the 6,900 United States forces there, and more than 1,100 NATO ally and partner forces have paid the ultimate price in service to the collective defense of NATO.

(11) NATO took the lead in helping combat the terrorist threat in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force and Operation Resolute Support, contributing to the safety of the United States and the international community.

(12) All 29 NATO allies and many NATO partners are contributing to the Global Coalition to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

(13) Approximately 18,000 military personnel are currently engaged in NATO missions around the world, conducting operations in Afghanistan, Kosovo, the Mediterranean, and off the Horn of Africa.

(14) NATO conducts a range of maritime security operations in the Mediterranean and is essential to establishing stability along the borders of Europe and to responding to the ongoing refugee and migrant crisis.

(15) For nearly 10 years, NATO has provided airlift support for the mission of the African Union in Somalia, as well as assisted with training the African Standby Force at the request of the African Union.

(16) For more than 17 years, NATO has led peace-support operations in Kosovo to maintain safety and security in a volatile region.

(17) NATO has three standing forces on active duty at all times to defend the Alliance, air policing capability, maritime forces, and an integrated air defense system.

(18) Whereas NATO allies and the international community continue to look to NATO to deter the increasingly revanchist activities of Russia.

(19) Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Joseph Dunford, testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate on July 19, 2015, that Russia presents the ''greatest existential threat'' to the United States.

(20) The malign actions of Russia—its 2008 incursion into Georgia, its illegal annexation of Crimea, its continued military action in Ukraine, its targeting of civilians in Syria, its ongoing information war in Europe, its continued violations of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Agreement, and its cyberattacks aimed at influencing United States elections—have violated international laws and norms.

(21) Russia continues to use disinformation campaigns and promote state propaganda to discredit democracy and undermine NATO members.

(22) Since the illegal annexation of Crimea and direct support to the conflict in Eastern Ukraine by Russia in 2014, NATO members have undertaken the biggest reinforcement of the collective defense of NATO since the end of the Cold War, enhancing allied readiness and deterrence measures in response to Russian aggression.

(23) The efforts of NATO to confront and deter Russian aggression in Eastern Europe have included a three-fold increase in the size of the NATO Response Force (NRF) to 40,000 troops; the creation of a Spearhead Force of 5,000 troops capable of deploying within a few days to respond to any threat against an ally, particularly on the eastern flank of NATO; the forward deployment of up to 4,000 troops to Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; an increase in the air policing and maritime missions of NATO in Eastern Europe; and a significant increase in NATO training and military exercises in Eastern Europe.

(24) Following the invasion of Ukraine by Russia in 2014, the United States established Operation Atlantic Resolve and the European Reassurance Initiative to reassure NATO allies that the United States would uphold its global security commitments and work in coordination with European partners to deter Russian aggression.

(25) Since 2014, Operation Atlantic Resolve and the European Reassurance Initiative have demonstrated the continued commitment of the United States to its NATO allies and partners by engaging in deterrence and security measures against potential Russian aggression in the region.

(26) Whereas the United States is further strengthening its force presence in Europe through the continuous deployment of an armored brigade combat team to Poland on a rotating basis.

(27) On January 6, 2017, as a part of Operation Atlantic Resolve, 3,500 United States troops from the 4th Infantry Division in Fort Carson, Colorado, along with more than 2,500 military vehicles, were deployed to Eastern Europe to deter regional aggression.

(28) Continued United States leadership in NATO is critical to ensuring that NATO remains the greatest military alliance in history.

(29) All NATO members have recommitted themselves to sharing the security burden of NATO at the 2014 NATO Wales Summit by pledging to meet the defense spending target for NATO members of 2 percent of gross domestic product within 10 years.

(30) The United States, Greece, Poland, Estonia, and the United Kingdom all have exceeded that defense spending target.

(31) Since the Wales Summit, Latvia, Lithuania, and many other allies have increased defense spending in an effort to meet that defense spending target.

(32) NATO remains committed to its open door policy on enlargement, working with countries in the Euro-Atlantic region that aspire to join NATO to help meet the requirements for membership.

(33) General James Jones, United States Marine Corps (retired), former National Security Advisor, testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate in July 2016 that ''[o]ur 27 NATO allies offer America forward basing, which allows us to better fight enemies like ISIS and deter adversaries like the new Russia and to meet shared challenges. Twenty-eight countries acting as one is a powerful alliance''.

(34) Secretary of Defense James Mattis testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, during his hearing as nominee for Secretary of Defense, that ''[w]e must also embrace our international alliances and security partnerships. History is clear: Nations with strong allies thrive and those without them wither''.

(35) There is a long tradition of strong bipartisan agreement that participation in NATO strengthens the security of the United States.

(36) NATO is the first peacetime military alliance the United States entered into outside the Western Hemisphere and today remains the largest peacetime military alliance in the world.

(37) A fractured NATO alliance would harm the interests of the United States and embolden adversaries of the United States.

(38) A strong and united Europe is important to United States strategic interests.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate—

(1) to pledge that the United States will continue to maintain strong leadership and strengthen its commitments to NATO;

(2) to strongly encourage NATO members to fulfill their pledge to invest at least 2 percent of gross domestic product on defense spending, invest at least 20 percent of such spending on major equipment (including research and development), and shoulder appropriate responsibility within NATO;

(3) to welcome Montenegro as the newest member of NATO;

(4) to recognize the historic contribution and sacrifice NATO member countries have made while combating terrorism in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force and Operation Resolute Support; and

(5) to honor the men and women who served under NATO and gave their lives to promote peace, security, and international cooperation since 1949.

SA 221. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 13. UKRANIAN ENERGY SECURITY.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereign and territorial integrity;

(2) to condemn and oppose all of the destabilizing efforts by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine in violation of its obligations and international commitments;

(3) to never recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Government of the Russian Federation or the separation of any portion of Ukrainian territory through the use of military force;

(4) to deter the Government of the Russian Federation from further destabilizing and invading Ukraine and other independent countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the Caucuses;

(5) to assist in promoting reform in regulatory oversight and operations in Ukraine's energy sector, including the establishment and empowerment of an independent regulatory organization;

(6) to encourage and support fair competition, market liberalization, and reliability in Ukraine's energy sector;

(7) to help Ukraine and United States allies and partners in Europe reduce their dependence on Russian energy resources, especially natural gas, which the Government of the Russian Federation uses as a weapon to coerce, intimidate, and influence other countries;

(8) to work with European Union member states and European Union institutions to promote energy security through developing diversified and liberalized energy markets that provide diversified sources, suppliers, and routes;

(9) to continue to oppose the NordStream 2 pipeline given its detrimental impacts on the European Union's energy security, gas market development in Central and Eastern Europe, and energy reforms in Ukraine; and

(10) that the United States Government should prioritize the export of United States energy resources in order to create American jobs, help United States allies and partners, and strengthen United States foreign policy.

(b) PLAN TO PROMOTE ENERGY SECURITY IN UKRAINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of Energy, shall work with the Government of Ukraine to develop a plan to increase energy security in Ukraine, increase the amount of energy produced in Ukraine, and reduce Ukraine's reliance on energy imports from the Russian Federation.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan developed under paragraph (1) shall include strategies for market liberalization, effective regulation and oversight, supply diversification, energy reliability, and energy efficiency, such as through supporting—

(A) the promotion of advanced technology and modern operating practices in Ukraine's oil and gas sector;

(B) modern geophysical and meteorological work followed by international tenders to help attract qualified investment into exploration and development of areas with untapped resources in Ukraine;

(C) a broadening of Ukraine's electric power transmission interconnection with Europe;

(D) the strengthening of Ukraine's capability to maintain electric power grid stability and reliability;

(E) independent regulatory oversight and operations of Ukraine's gas market and electricity sector;

(F) the implementation of primary gas law including pricing, tariff structure, and legal regulatory implementation;

(G) privatization of government owned energy companies through credible legal frameworks and a transparent process compliant with international best practices;

(H) procurement and transport of emergency fuel supplies, including reverse pipeline flows from Europe;

(I) provision of technical assistance for crisis planning, crisis response, and public outreach;

(J) repair of infrastructure to enable the transport of fuel supplies;

(K) repair of power generating or power transmission equipment or facilities; and

(L) improved building energy efficiency and other measures designed to reduce energy demand in Ukraine.

(3) REPORTS.—

(A) IMPLEMENTATION OF UKRAINE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2014 PROVISIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing the status of implementing the provisions required under section 7(c) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–272), including detailing the plans required under that section, the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth under that section, and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies developed pursuant to that section.

(B) REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing the plan developed under paragraph (1), the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth in paragraph (2), and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies.

(C) BRIEFINGS.—The Secretary of State, or a designee of the Secretary, shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress not later than 30 days after the submission of each report under subparagraph (A). In addition, the Department of State shall make relevant officials available upon request to brief the appropriate committees of Congress on all available information that relates directly or indirectly to Ukraine or energy security in Eastern Europe.

(D) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State a total of $30,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 through 2019 to carry out the strategies set forth in subsection (b)(2) and other activities under this section related to the promotion of energy security in Ukraine.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the responsibilities required and authorities provided under section 7 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–272).

SA 222. Mr. TILLIS (for Mr. MORAN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 174, recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service; as follows:

On page 6, strike the fourth whereas clause.

On page 6, in the seventh whereas clause, strike ''the United Kingdom and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation'' and insert ''partner organizations''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 10:15 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing to consider pending nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017 at a time to be determined, to hold a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 10 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Brock Long.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. in SR–418, to conduct a hearing titled, ''Examining the Veterans Choice Program and the Future of Care in the Community.''

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017 from 10 a.m., in room SH–216 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold an open hearing entitled ''FISA Amendments Act.''

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017 from 2 p.m., in room SH–219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Committee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7,

2017, at 2:30 p.m., in open session, to receive testimony on Department of Defense nuclear acquisition programs and the nuclear doctrine.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES' SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on National Parks is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF LIONS CLUBS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 174.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 174) recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, 100 years ago today, Lions Clubs International was created in Chicago, IL, and today the Senate is considering adoption of this resolution, S. Res. 174, commemorating this tremendous occasion. One hundred years later, Lions Clubs International is the world's largest service club, with more than 1.4 million members who participate in more than 46,000 clubs across the globe.

In my State of Kansas alone, we have more than 270 Lions Clubs, and I have been a member of Lions Clubs since I graduated from college, went to work, and got involved in the community. I have seen firsthand how Lions Clubs make a significant difference in the communities they are in, as well as their reach around the globe in addressing problems in their communities and humanitarian needs around the world. Lions are committed to caring for those less fortunate, from young to old, and they do so in a way that shows care and compassion. It is all about the right motivation. They care about people, and they make a difference. It is this selfless service and commitment to a greater good that is needed in our country today.

In the face of serious challenges, I believe those who volunteer their time and their resources in community civic clubs, not-for-profits, schools and fundraisers, in churches and charities are the ones who have the greatest impact on people's lives. This kind of involvement at the local level has the potential to make meaningful and tangible differences in the lives of people around us, perhaps more so than even the best intentioned Federal programs that come from the Nation's Capital. I am of the view that we change the world one soul, one person at a time, and it happens in Lions Clubs and their efforts in their communities and globally every day.

Over their 100 years of existence, the Lions Clubs have supported the blind, encouraged the young, provided relief to those struck by tragedy, and fought to eradicate disease. They have contributed hundreds of millions of dollars to humanitarian work internationally and are committed to serving 100 million people around the globe.

As we reflect upon all the good that has come from the last 100 years among Lions Clubs members, may our commitment to our neighbors, our communities, and our fellow men and women be strengthened and renewed. Today, Lions Clubs begin another century of service to others as they seek out ways to better our world.

I offer my congratulations to Bob Corlew of Milton, TN, who is the international president, and I welcome Lions members from around the globe as they gather in Chicago later this month for their international convention. From 100 years ago in Chicago to this month, 100 years in which they celebrate their birth, the Lions Clubs motto is ''We serve.''

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the Moran amendment to the preamble be considered and agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 174) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 222) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To remove references to specific entities)

On page 6, strike the fourth whereas clause.

On page 6, in the seventh whereas clause, strike ''the United Kingdom and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation'' and insert ''partner organizations''.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to. The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 174

Whereas, on June 7, 1917, Chicago business leader Melvin Jones founded Lions Clubs International in Chicago, Illinois, based on the principle that ''[y]ou can't get very far until you start doing something for somebody else'';

Whereas the motto of Lions Clubs International, ''We Serve''—

(1) was selected in 1954 after having been submitted by Lion D.A. Stevenson of Font Hill, Ontario, in an international contest; and

(2) applies to the charitable and humanitarian priorities of Lions Clubs International, including—

(A) eyesight preservation and blindness prevention;

(B) services for individuals with disabilities;

(C) hearing and speech conservation;

(D) diabetes awareness;

(E) youth outreach;

(F) services for older individuals;

(G) activities that promote international goodwill;

(H) disaster relief; and

(I) environmental protection;

Whereas, with over 46,000 clubs and 1,400,000 members in over 200 countries and geographical areas around the globe, Lions Clubs International is the largest service organization in the world;

Whereas the purposes of Lions Clubs International include—

(1) to create and foster a spirit of understanding among people around the world;

(2) to promote the principles of good government and good citizenship;

(3) to take an active interest in the civic, cultural, social, and moral welfare of the community;

(4) to provide a forum for the open discussion of all matters of public interest, except that members of Lions Clubs International may not debate partisan politics and sectarian religion;

(5) to encourage service-minded individuals to serve their communities without personal financial reward; and

(6) to encourage efficiency and promote high ethical standards in commerce, industry, public works, and professional and private endeavors;

Whereas, on March 12, 1920, a Lions Club was chartered in Windsor, Ontario, Canada, and Lions Clubs became an international organization;

Whereas, in 1925, at the Lions Club in Cedar Point, Ohio, Helen Keller charged members of Lions Clubs International with becoming ''knights of the blind in the crusade against darkness'';

Whereas, in 1926, polar explorer and member of the District of Columbia Lions Club, Admiral Richard E. Byrd, Jr., flew over the North Pole carrying the flag of Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1930, after witnessing an individual with a vision impairment having difficulty crossing a street, Lion George Bonham painted a cane white with a red band for use by visually impaired individuals;

Whereas, in 1931—

(1) the first Lions Club was established south of the United States in Nuevo Laredo, Mexico; and

(2) the first Lions Clubs International convention was held in Toronto, Ontario;

Whereas, in 1935, during the Lions Clubs International convention in Mexico City, Amelia Earhart, who was an honorary member of the New York City Lions Club, completed a record-breaking nonstop flight from Los Angeles, California, to Mexico;

Whereas, in 1939, the members of the Detroit Uptown Lions Club converted an old farmhouse in the State of Michigan into a school to train dog guides for visually impaired individuals, helping to popularize dog guides worldwide;

Whereas, on June 6, 1939, the first Little League baseball game was played at Park Point in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, after Lion Carl Edwin Stotz appealed to Lions Clubs International, the Young Men's Christian Association, and other community partners for support to provide an organized baseball program for children;

Whereas, in 1944, the first eye bank in the world was established in New York City, and as of March 2017, most eye banks are sponsored by Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1945, Lions Clubs International assisted in drafting the Charter of the United Nations, which began a lasting relationship between Lions Clubs International and the

United Nations that includes Lions Clubs International aid and volunteers for—

(1) the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund;

(2) the World Health Organization;

(3) the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; and

(4) other humanitarian projects;

Whereas, in 1957, the Leo Clubs youth program of Lions Clubs International was established to provide young people with the opportunity for personal development through volunteer work;

Whereas, as of March 2017, there are approximately 157,000 Leos and 600 Leo Clubs in over 200 countries and geographical areas worldwide;

Whereas, in 1968, the Lions Clubs International Foundation (referred to in this preamble as ''LCIF'') was established to assist Lions Clubs International with global and large-scale local humanitarian projects;

Whereas LCIF has given more than $826,000,000 in grants to support the humanitarian work of Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1972, LCIF awarded its first grant, in the amount of $5,000, to assist flood victims in South Dakota;

Whereas, in 1977, Lion Jimmy Carter became the 39th President of the United States;

Whereas, in 1985, LCIF awarded its first Major Catastrophe Grant, in the amount of $50,000, for earthquake relief in Mexico;

Whereas, in 1986, Mother Teresa accepted a Lions Humanitarian Award;

Whereas, in 1987, Lions Clubs International amended its bylaws and invited women to become members, and women are now the fastest growing group of new members in Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1990, LCIF launched SightFirst, an initiative that—

(1) assists Lions Clubs International in activities to restore eyesight and prevent blindness on a global scale; and

(2) eventually raised more than $415,000,000 to target low vision, trachoma, river blindness, childhood blindness, diabetic retinopathy, and glaucoma;

Whereas, in 1995, LCIF began a partnership with the Carter Center, led by former President and Lion Jimmy Carter, to combat river blindness in Africa and Latin America, and by 2003, LCIF and the Carter Center had provided 50,000,000 river blindness treatments;

Whereas, in 2001, LCIF partnered with the Special Olympics on Opening Eyes, an initiative to provide vision screening for Special Olympics athletes;

Whereas, in 2002, Lions Clubs International chartered a club in China, which became the first voluntary membership group in China;

Whereas, in 2007, the Financial Times ranked LCIF as the best nongovernmental organization worldwide with which to establish a partnership;

Whereas, in 2011, LCIF awarded its 10,000th grant, bringing the total amount awarded to grant recipients by LCIF to $708,000,000;

Whereas, in 2013, LCIF partnered with the GAVI Alliance to protect millions of children from measles and rubella in 2013;

Whereas LCIF committed $30,000,000 for immunizations, an amount matched by partner organizations;

Whereas, in 2013, with the support of Lions Clubs International and the Carter Center, river blindness was eliminated in Colombia; and

Whereas, in 2014, Lions Clubs International launched the Centennial Service Challenge, a global initiative to serve 100,000,000 people around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Lions Clubs International on its 100th anniversary on June 7, 2017;

(2) recognizes Lions Clubs International for 100 years of promoting community service and humanitarian assistance;

(3) encourages Lions Clubs International to continue to emphasize the values of community service and improving the community for all individuals; and

(4) applauds Lions Clubs International for instilling in young people the value of community service.

CONGRATULATING AND HONORING FERMI NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LABORATORY ON 50 YEARS OF GROUNDBREAKING DISCOVERIES

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 187, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 187) congratulating and honoring Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory on 50 years of groundbreaking discoveries.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 187) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2017

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 8; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, postcloture; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on the motion to proceed to S. 722.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators WYDEN, MERKLEY, PETERS, and SANDERS.

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

The Senator from Vermont.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, in the U.S. Senate, it is the Parliamentarian's office that determines whether a reconciliation bill is in compliance with the rules of the Senate. That is not the function of the chairman of the Budget Committee. If it were, we could save taxpayers' money and get rid of the Parliamentarian's office, but that is not what we should be doing.

I am extremely concerned, therefore, that the chairman of the Budget Committee, in an apparently unprecedented manner, appears to have made that determination himself with regard to the Trump-Ryan healthcare bill that was passed several weeks ago in the House. As I understand it, the Parliamentarian has made a narrow ruling with respect to the jurisdiction of a provision in this bill that would eliminate healthcare subsidies for low-income Native Americans.

I look forward to hearing from the Parliamentarian as soon as possible on the broader ruling on whether the Trump-Ryan healthcare bill is in compliance with the instructions contained in the budget resolution requiring this bill to save at least $1 billion in the HELP Committee and at least $1 billion within the Finance Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Oregon.

HONORING THE HEROES OF THE PORTLAND ATTACK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, Senator MERKLEY and I have come today together to discuss our resolution honoring the heroes of the Portland attack. On May 26 in Portland, our hometown, our community lost two very brave people: Ricky Best and Taliesin Myrddin Namkai-Meche. They stood up courageously against terrorism and for core American and Oregon values of tolerance and freedom.

Along with Micah David-Cole Fletcher, who was seriously injured, these three extraordinary Samaritans stepped in to protect two girls who were being terrorized on public transit by a man menacing them because he thought they were Muslim. These three Oregon heroes did not run when they saw danger. Instead, these three advanced toward the danger.

I paid my respects last week at the beautiful memorial that my fellow Portlanders created at the transit station where this attack occurred. I can assure my colleagues that the message of the memorial could not be more clear: The heroes of Portland stood up to terror, and we ought to be willing to call out the hate and the evil they confronted.

So today, I join with our friend and colleague Senator MERKLEY to express

our deepest condolences to the families, the friends of the victims, so that we can all make clear how much we appreciate them and how grateful we are—and we all are—to be able to stand with the two girls who were being terrorized and to support all community efforts to overcome hatred and bigotry and violence.

As a son of parents who fled the Nazis, I know full well what hate speech is all about. There must be zero tolerance for hate speech and violence because otherwise you give it room to fester and grow. Hate speech and violence must have no place in Oregon or anywhere else in our great Nation.

With these three Oregon heroes forever in our memories, we must and we will recommit to fighting hate, violence, and terrorism every chance that we have. We urge adoption of this important resolution.

I yield to my friend and colleague Senator MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague Senator WYDEN for submitting this resolution. I am proud to partner with him as we address this senseless, deadly attack that occurred back home in Oregon just 12 days ago.

Robert Kennedy once said: ''We must recognize that this short life can neither be ennobled or enriched by hatred.'' We have been reminded of that in this part of our history in the last year and a half in which we have seen acts of hatred flourishing across the country, preying on divisions among parts of our society. It is incumbent on all of us to call out the unacceptability of hate speech and certainly to work to bring unity where there has been division.

This all came together in dramatic, deadly fashion on the MAX train when a man spouting hatred and anti-Muslim rhetoric accosted two young women sitting on the train. Three men stood up and sprang into action and told him that was unacceptable.

I wish we could turn back the clock and have the incident stop right there with that intervention. These men, by being willing to stand up in that setting, are champions of justice. They were saying that this is unacceptable. They were saying that it must stop. But then this confrontation turned deadly, with the man spouting the hate speech pulling a knife, stabbing all three of these champions, killing two of them, and nearly killing the third. These individuals, Rick Best and Taliesin Myrddin Namkai-Meche, paid with their lives. The third individual, Micah David-Cole Fletcher, came very close to losing his as well.

We have been holding the families in our hearts and in our prayers. The community came together and had a vigil and another ceremony at the Muslim educational center and at the funerals to let the families know that, across Oregon, people are carrying them in their hearts and prayers. Certainly, one of those prayers was for the full recovery of Micah David-Cole Fletcher. He is back on his feet, and it is just a beautiful thing to see that he is out of the hospital. He spoke very eloquent words that I would like to share with you. In the days after the attack, he said:

> I want you to imagine that for a second, being the little girl on that MAX. This man is screaming at you. His face is a pile of knives, his body is a gun, everything about him is cocked, loaded and ready to kill you. There's a history here with this. You can feel that this has happened before. And the only thing that was different was the names and faces.

Micah continued. He said:

> And then a stranger, two strangers, three strangers, come to your aid, they try to help you, and that pile of knives just throws itself at them. Kills them.

Well, this was an extraordinarily traumatic experience for these young girls simply to be accosted on the train and all the more so to see that those who came to their rescue were stabbed, with two of them dying and the third badly injured.

Our hearts are, again, so connected to the families. We must have a determination as a society to put healing where there has been division, to put empathy where there has been antipathy, to replace hatred with a connection, with a love.

Robert Kennedy said in that same speech when he was commenting on the fact that nothing has ever been ennobled or enriched by hatred—he continued to say this:

> But we can perhaps remember—if only for a time—that those who live with us are our brothers, that they share with us the same short moment of life, that they seek—as do we—nothing but the chance to live out their lives in purpose and in happiness, winning what satisfaction and fulfillment that they can.

Can't we come together as a society and enable each person to be able to live out their lives in purpose and happiness and set aside this divisiveness and this hatred?

I hope on this occasion, as we honor the incredible heroism of the three men who sprang into action and as we mourn the loss of two of them, that we all will dedicate ourselves to this purpose of creating a connection, creating unity, and creating respect and that we shall see the banishment of hate speech and hate violence.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

(The remarks of Mr. PETERS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1308 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:47 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

RYAN MCCARTHY, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE PATRICK JOSEPH MURPHY.

PATRICK M. SHANAHAN, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ROBERT O. WORK, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JEFFREY BOSSERT CLARK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE JOHN CHARLES CRUDEN.

THE JUDICIARY

ALLISON H. EID, OF COLORADO, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT, VICE NEIL M. GORSUCH, ELEVATED.

RALPH R. ERICKSON, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT, VICE KERMIT E. BYE, RETIRED.

DABNEY LANGHORNE FRIEDRICH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE REGGIE B. WALTON, RETIRED.

TIMOTHY J. KELLY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE ROSEMARY M. COLLYER, RETIRED.

TREVOR N. MCFADDEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE RICHARD J. LEON, RETIRED.

STEPHEN S. SCHWARTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LYNN JEANNE BUSH, TERM EXPIRED.

MICHAEL P. ALLEN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE BRUCE E. KASOLD, TERM EXPIRED.

AMANDA L. MEREDITH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE WILLIAM A. MOORMAN, RETIRED.

JOSEPH L. TOTH, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LAWRENCE B. HAGEL, RETIRED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EMILY BROWNE WINGED FOOT AWARD

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Emily Browne on winning the Winged Foot Scholar-Athlete Award.

Due to her hard work and dedication, Ms. Browne managed to be the star athlete of both her basketball and lacrosse teams at Barron Collier High School, all while maintaining a stellar grade point average. Her successful balancing of athletic and academic activities shows maturity and discipline beyond her years.

I am proud of Emily's achievements on and off the field. The award is well deserved.

PRAISING LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES INVOLVED IN SOLVING THE MURDER OF CHIEF DEPUTY CLINT GREENWOOD

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep appreciation and admiration to all of the Texas law enforcement officers who worked so diligently in getting to the bottom of the tragic and senseless murder of Harris County Precinct 3 Constable, Assistant Chief Deputy Greenwood.

My hat goes off to the Baytown Police Department, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), U.S. Marshals Service, Houston Police Department, Gulf Coast Violent Offenders Task Force, Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS), Texas Rangers, Harris County Sheriff's Department, Harris County Precinct 3 Constable's Office and Harris County District Attorney. These men and women showed tremendous determination and commitment in their efforts to find this evil perpetrator and deliver justice. While we continue to mourn the loss of another one of our brave Texas law enforcement officers, their hard work and tireless efforts have helped bring healing and closure to the family and the entire law enforcement community.

My prayers continue to be with the family of Assistant Chief Deputy Greenwood.

CONGRATULATING BLOUKE CARUS ON 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a constituent of mine, Blouke Carus of Peru, Illinois on turning 90 this month.

Mr. Carus is Chairman Emeritus of Carus Corporation a Peru-based company that assists municipalities and industries with utilizing products for environmental cleanup. Before that, Mr. Carus served as the Chairman of Carus Publishing Company, which published educational magazines and books for children.

Because of his lifelong interest in education, Mr. Carus served as a Presidential appointee on the National Council on Education Research, and continued his work as a community leader by helping to establish the Illinois Valley Community College.

Mr. Carus obtained a B.S. in Electrical Engineering from the California Institute of Technology in 1949, after having served his country honorably in the U.S. Navy. He is married to Marianne Carus, and they have three children and four grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Sixteenth Congressional District, I would like to sincerely congratulate Mr. Carus and the rest of his family on this amazing milestone and life achievement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 2017, I was not present for the recorded votes on Roll Call No. 286 and 287. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and agree, as amended and YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and agree, as amended.

16TH DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AWARDS

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to law enforcement men and women who have provided distinctive service to the people of Florida's 16th Congressional District.

Law enforcement is a demanding profession that requires sacrifice, courage and a dedication to serve others. Every day, brave men and women put themselves in harm's way to enforce the laws of our society and protect public safety. They deserve our gratitude and respect.

Six years ago, I established the 16th District Congressional Law Enforcement Awards, CLEA, to give special recognition to law enforcement officers, departments, or units for exceptional achievement.

This year, I will present Congressional Law Enforcement Awards to the following winners chosen by an independent panel comprised of current and retired law enforcement personnel representing a cross-section of the district's law enforcement community:

Officer Jason Nuttall of the Bradenton Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Captain John Walsh, Captain Debra Kaspar, Lieutenant Jon Varley, Community Affairs Director Kaitlyn Perez, Deputy Phillip Mockler, Detective Tim Speth and Investigator Lynn Thomson of the Sarasota County Sheriff's will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Detective Richard Wilson of the Palmetto Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Officer Alan Bores of the Holmes Beach Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Detective Justin Warren of the Manatee County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Sergeant Robert Armstrong of the Sarasota Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Deputy Kevin Smetana of the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Master Sergeant George Taunton of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Career Service Award.

Trooper Caleb Kerr and Trooper Brett Fitzpatrick of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Preservation of Life Award.

Sergeant Patrick Roberts of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Above and Beyond the Call of Duty Award.

Pastor Patrick Miller, Pastor Vincent Smith, Doctor Harriet Moore, Geoffry Gilot and Al-Muta Hawks all affiliated with the Boys and Girls Club of Sarasota will receive the Associate Service Award.

The Manatee County Special Investigations Division will receive the Unit Citation Award. The members of this unit are: Major William Jordan, Captain Todd Shear, Lieutenant Anthony Carr, Division Secretary Toni Burton, Administrative Assistant Cindy Hoffman, Sergeant Jason Powell, Detective James Parrish, Detective Kim Zink, Detective Greg Dunlap, Detective Mike Diaz, Bruce Benjamin (Crime Stoppers), Amber Hoffman (Manager), Erica Chenard (UCR Coordinator), Criminal Analyst Ashley Eannarino, Criminal Analyst Elicia Main, Intel Analyst Don Brown, Criminal Analyst John Ferrito, Intel Analyst Elizabeth Thomas, Sergeant Evelio Perez, Detective Joseph Petta, Detective Justin Warren, Detective

Derek Pollock, Detective Eric Davis, Detective Ray Richter, Detective Patrick Thames, Detective Scott Williamson, Sergeant Gary Combee, Detective William Freel, Detective Maria Gillum, Detective Bryce Wilhelm, Detective Jonathan Kruse, Sergeant Steve Barron, Detective Randall Walker, Detective Brian Beck, Detective Shayne Rousseau, Detective Jeremy Martin, Detective Robert Brigham, Sergeant Isaac Redmond, Detective Rafael Ortegon, Detective Christopher Gallagher, Detective Joel Taylor, Detective David Bocchino, and Detective Lourdes Santiago.

RECOGNIZING COMMANDER JoANN BURDIAN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COAST GUARD

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, each of us that serve in this distinguished body has the deepest and most profound respect for the men and women who serve in America's Armed Forces. It's because of their service and sacrifice that this great nation is able to carry the banner of freedom across the globe and the American people sleep safe at night.

Throughout history, Americans have faithfully answered the nation's call through periods of conflict and peace—and each of the service branches have earned their place as pillars of America's defense shield. That shield first and foremost starts at America's shores and it's the Coast Guard that is the nation's first line of protection against criminals and contraband entering the country through the seas.

The Coast Guard's backbone is its personnel and I've had the great honor of serving as Chairman of the House Subcommittee with direct purview over this great organization, which has afforded me the privilege to observe our Coast Guard in action. But on this specific occasion, I want to recognize one Coast Guardsman in particular who's had not only an immense impact on the organization itself, but also this entire institution.

Commander JoAnn Burdian has led the Congressional Affairs office for the Coast Guard for the last several years and today marks her last day serving in a capacity that has made us wiser and even more appreciative of the immense work shouldered by the Coast Guard each and every day. Her career in the Coast Guard will continue in her new assignment in Seattle, Washington, but her departure no doubt is a great loss for the entire Congress.

Even so, our loss here is the Coast Guard's gain—and I have all the confidence that Commander Burdian's exemplary leadership and talents will provide tremendous value to the next generation of leaders that will continue serving the nation's interest as members of the Coast Guard. And when I think of the type of leader that this nation depends on to lead America's men and women in uniform, Commander Burdian is the example to follow. Her reputation has been forged through years of operational experience and leadership, and her sense of commitment to service and country has always defined her approach to representing the best interests of the Coast Guard.

Commander Burdian is a relentless advocate for her service. Her pioneering spirit and deep understanding of Coast Guard programs and priorities have informed me and others in our collective work and the Coast Guard is on better footing today thanks to her immense contributions.

I'm honored to have served with such an outstanding patriot and I want to wish Commander Burdian the best of luck as she endeavors on a new assignment and the next chapter of her life. She's a Coast Guardsman at heart—but I'm also proud to call her a friend. And I ask today that we all recognize this great American for all the work she's done and will continue doing on behalf of the nation.

COACH BILL KRAMER

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Coach Bill Kramer and the news of his induction into the Florida High School Athletic Association's Hall of Fame for the Class of 2017.

Coach Kramer has led the Naples High School football team since 1998. Under his leadership, the Golden Eagles won two state championships, six regional titles, and fourteen district titles.

Additionally, Coach Kramer is dedicated to teaching young men how to cope with many of life's difficulties. He works to instill the values of teamwork, perseverance, and discipline in his players. I thank Coach Kramer for the positive impact he has made, and will continue to make, on the Naples community.

STORM MANNING

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Storm Manning for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Storm Manning is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Storm Manning is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Storm Manning for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF MICHAEL LOMBARDO, RECIPIENT OF LEADERSHIP WILKES-BARRE'S DISTINGUISHED LEADERSHIP ALUMNI AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael Lombardo. Michael will receive the Distinguished Leadership Alumni Award from Leadership Wilkes-Barre on June 8. Leadership Wilkes-Barre is a local development company that provides future leaders with the resources they need to be successful members of the community. The Distinguished Leadership Alumni Award is awarded annually to an individual who has demonstrated outstanding community leadership and service to neighbors.

Michael is a graduate of Bucknell University and holds a Bachelor's Degree in Psychology and Master's Degree in School Psychology and Counseling. He currently works at Quad Three Group, Inc., an architectural engineering and environmental science firm, as the Director of Business Development & Marketing. Michael served as the mayor of Pittston from 1998 to 2006. He was later appointed to Pittston's Redevelopment Authority Board. Michael also serves on the boards of Leadership Wilkes-Barre and the Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce. He has served as the Vice Chair of the Pittston Festival Association for the past 19 years.

Michael resides in Pittston with his wife, Susan. They are the proud parents of twin daughters, Catherine and Kristen. They are parishioners of St. John the Evangelist Church, where Michael is a lector. He is also a Fourth Degree Member of the Knights of Columbus.

It is an honor to recognize Michael as he receives the Distinguished Leadership Alumni Award from Leadership Wilkes-Barre. May he continue serving as a guiding force in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

HONORING TIM McKINNEY'S RETIREMENT

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tim McKinney for his years of service in improving the quality of life of residents of Fort Worth, and the broader community of Tarrant County, as President and CEO of United Way of Tarrant County (UWTC).

Mr. McKinney was raised in Fort Worth, Texas and received his Bachelor of Business Administration from Texas Christian University. After college, he served in the U.S. Air Force for five years where he attained the rank of Captain, and received the Air Medal with three oak leaf clusters. Following his military service, McKinney enjoyed a 36-year career in banking where he eventually earned his position as the President of Bank of America's Fort Worth Region.

As CEO of UWTC, Tim McKinney was instrumental in the creation and implementation

of a visionary strategic plan that moved UWTC to a results-oriented ''impact'' model that embraces nontraditional community partners. UWTC and its partners help 300,000 people annually throughout Tarrant County.

Tim McKinney's leadership as a fundraising professional led UWTC through transformational change. During his tenure, UWTC's strong financial health and commitment to accountability and transparency earned the organization a top 4-star rating from Charity Navigator for five consecutive years. This recognition places UWTC among the top 6 percent of charities evaluated by Charity Navigator who have received at least 5 consecutive 4-star ratings. In addition, under his leadership, UWTC's fundraising placed it among the top 4 percent of all United Ways in America.

In addition to his work at UWTC, Tim McKinney served and continues to serve on the boards of several organizations. As the Board Chair of the Botanical Research Institute of Texas (BRIT), he was active in its fundraising efforts and in developing the new BRIT building and campus. He also served on the JLWest Foundation Board and helped to establish the James L. West Presbyterian Special Care Center.

Through his work in the Tarrant County community, Tim McKinney has earned a reputation as a highly ethical and trustworthy professional who values transparency, honesty, and innovation.

I honor Mr. McKinney's years of dedicated service to the Tarrant County community, and congratulate him on his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present on the House floor because my flight was cancelled due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 286, and yea on Roll Call No. 287.

SAMANTHA MOLINA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Samantha Molina for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Samantha Molina is a student at Arvada K–8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Samantha Molina is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Samantha Molina for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on Roll Call No. 286 and No. 287.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 286, and YEA on Roll Call No. 287.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DELAWARE & LEHIGH NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR'S DESIGNATION AS A SMITHSONIAN AFFILIATE

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor as it becomes America's first National Heritage Area to receive a partnership designation from the Smithsonian Institution. The D&L, as we in eastern Pennsylvania call it, preserves the historic canal that carried anthracite and iron from Wilkes-Barre to Philadelphia. It is one of three National Heritage Areas in my congressional district, and it runs through three of the 17th District's counties. I am proud to support areas like the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor by cosponsoring the National Heritage Area Authorization Act.

A National Heritage Area is a site designated by Congress for the purposes of preserving history and encouraging an appreciation of the site. It is a place where natural, scenic, cultural, and historic resources combine to offer a landscape of stories celebrating our unique journey and status as a region. A National Heritage Area is a lived-in landscape and is administered by a state government, non-profit, or private corporation rather than the National Park Service. It is a place where stewards collaborate with residents to forge a way to make heritage relevant for local interests and needs. This community-driven approach to heritage conservation and economic development must be preserved and grown. These sites are essential to how we share who we were, who we are, and who we might become with the next generation.

The Smithsonian Institution was founded in 1846 and is the world's largest museum, education, and research complex. It has over 216 affiliates. This affiliation partnership for the D&L comes on the heels of its recent merger with the National Canal Museum in Easton, Pennsylvania. The affiliation partnership designation will raise the profile of the D&L and help it better connect to nature, recreation, and our nation's industrial heritage. As a Smithsonian affiliate, the D&L will reap the benefits of co-branding, professional development, and customized client service to facilitate exhibition and artifact borrowing needs.

Those who know me well know my passions for preserving history, natural resources, and outdoor recreation opportunities. With the D&L, these passions are one. It is my honor to share with the House the story of a place that so well engenders a love of nature and of history and that now includes its welcome into the Smithsonian family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for votes Tuesday, June 6, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call votes 286 and 287.

SABASTIAN MEADOWS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sabastian Meadows for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sabastian Meadows is a student at Wayne Carle Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sabastian Meadows is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sabastian Meadows for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable conflict, I missed the following votes on June 6. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 286, and yea on Roll Call No. 287.

INTRODUCTION OF PATIENT CHOICE AND QUALITY CARE ACT OF 2017

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, from sweeping changes to how care is delivered, to

the rise of personalized medicine, patients today have more treatment options when facing advanced illness than ever before. With these medical advances, the line between life and death can sometimes be blurred, which has changed the way we must talk about how we want to live and die.

Despite these enormous changes, confronting an advanced illness or the end of life remains one of the most difficult and challenging situations any family faces.

There is substantial evidence that suggests the care individuals want to receive at the end of life is not necessarily the type of care they do receive. Patients, in fact, often receive aggressive treatment that not only substantially shortens their length of life, but its quality. At other times, patients find the health care system instead undervalues the quality of their life, withholding treatments they would otherwise want to receive.

Issues surrounding the end of life and advanced illness management become even more important when looking at the rapidly aging population in the United States. In 2014, Americans ages 65 and older made up 15 percent of the total population; by 2060 that share is projected to grow to 24 percent.

A recent survey conducted by The Economist and the Kaiser Family Foundation found that the majority of U.S. adults say the government is not prepared to deal with the aging population. The same survey found that a large majority of Americans believe both that patients and their families should have a greater say in which treatment options they receive, and that most Americans don't believe they have enough control over their medical decisions at the end of life. This must change.

Individuals should have every opportunity to actively participate in making decisions about their health care throughout their lives and should receive care consistent with their values, goals, and informed preferences. Patients should feel empowered to make informed choices about the health care they want and to have those care decisions honored by their providers and family.

During passage of Affordable Care Act, I saw an opportunity to apply lessons learned in Oregon with its landmark comprehensive palliative care programs, which give patients more of a say about the medical treatment they want at the end of life. I worked to ensure that Congress included a payment for doctors to talk to patients and families about advance care planning in the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, this provision wasn't included in the final legislation due to a breakdown of the legislative process.

After years of advocacy, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services designed a benefit allowing doctors to receive reimbursement for voluntary advance care planning conversations with their patients. For the first time, Medicare will pay for these critical doctor-patient discussions in the same way it pays for any other medical service.

Yet our work to improve end-of-life care is far from over, and it is for these reasons that I am introducing the bipartisan, bicameral Patient Choice and Quality Care Act of 2017. This legislation will strengthen advanced illness care by establishing a new model of care delivery that to better manage advanced illness, improve quality of care, and enhance training, resources, and tools for providers, patients, and their families.

Ideally, health care should work in sync with social, psychological, and spiritual support as the end of life approaches. Care near the end of life must be patient-centered and family-oriented. This legislation is supported by patient advocates, physicians, nurses, and the faith community, who understand how improving care delivery for advanced illness fundamentally improves quality of care and quality of life. To that end, I ask my colleagues to join me and support this important legislation.

HONORING RYAN DANT'S COLLEGE GRADUATION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ryan Dant. Ryan's father Mark Dant retired just last year as Assistant Chief at the Carrollton, Texas Police Department. As a young boy, Ryan was diagnosed with a rare disease called Mucopolysaccharidosis (MPS Type 1)—a disease so rare that it affects about 1 in 100,000 children.

Mr. Speaker, we recently observed National MPS Awareness Day on May 15.

At the time he was diagnosed, in the early 90s, there was no cure or even a treatment for MPS. Doctors told Ryan's parents—Jeanne and Mark—that he wouldn't make it to his 13th birthday.

Over time, the heartache of their son's diagnosis gave way to the steadfast perseverance that only a parent knows.

Scientist after scientist, through experimental treatments and research studies, Ryan's 13th birthday came and went.

Last Saturday, Jeanne and Mark Dant witnessed a miracle—their son Ryan, at age 29, received his college degree.

I congratulate Ryan on receiving his degree. His life's journey is an inspiration to us all.

SAMANTHA WARD

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Samantha (Sam) Ward for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Samantha Ward is a student at Wayne Carle Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Samantha Ward is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Samantha Ward for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on June 6, 2017 on account of attending my son's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

YEA for rollcall vote 286

YEA for rollcall vote 287

THE RETIREMENT OF CRAIG SOUZA

HON. DAVID ROUZER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to make special mention today of the retirement of Craig Souza, a gentleman who has contributed decades of service to North Carolina through his leadership in providing quality health care facilities throughout the state.

Craig has served as President and CEO of the North Carolina Health Care Facilities Association since 1977. He is a proud graduate of East Carolina University (ECU) and has the distinction of having served as chairman of the ECU Board of Trustees.

Mr. Souza has served in a number of leadership roles, including his service on the UNC Board of Governors, as past president of both the American Society of Health Care Association Executives and the Association Executives of North Carolina; and as a member of the Board of Directors of the North Carolina Institute of Medicine, the North Carolina Social Services Commission and the North Carolina Board of Examiners for Nursing Home Administrators. He also served with distinction as deputy secretary of the North Carolina Department of Human Resources.

Throughout his career, Mr. Souza has carried out his service with integrity and dedication providing our state with valued leadership and counsel in every endeavor.

In his retirement, Craig plans to continue to enjoy spending time with family, traveling, playing golf, watching Carolina Panthers football, and cheering on his beloved ECU Pirates.

On behalf of the State of North Carolina, thank Craig for his years of commitment and service. I wish him the very best as he enters this next chapter in his life.

IN RECOGNITION OF KATHLEEN STROUD FOR HER WORK AND ADVOCACY ON SOCIAL JUSTICE ISSUES

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Kathleen Stroud for her impactful leadership on social justice issues. Ms. Stroud has served Michigan with distinction in a variety of elected positions at the

state and local level and is the founder of Ann Arbor's Safe House program.

After graduating from Eastern Michigan University, Ms. Stroud began her career working to reduce domestic violence in Washtenaw County. She was then elected to the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners at the age of 28, where she served four consecutive terms from 1972 to 1980. During this time, she served on the Governor's Crime Victims Compensation Board and the Legislative Advisory Committee on Domestic Violence, where her advocacy and efforts resulted in Michigan passing comprehensive domestic violence legislation that included strong protections for women and children. Additionally, Ms. Stroud spearheaded the creation of a network of private homes to provide shelter for victims of domestic violence. This effort culminated in the opening of the Ann Arbor Safe House in 1992, the first publicly funded domestic violence shelter in the United States.

Ms. Stroud has been an outstanding advocate for children and families in need throughout her career. She has been involved with the National Organization for Women, since its founding in 1966, and remains active in the local American Association of University Women, where she has previously served as its president. These actions, along with her involvement in Ann Arbor Safe House, have helped to create a supportive and welcoming environment and provided much-need resources for domestic violence victims. Ms. Stroud has also worked to support these and other public health efforts during her 40-year tenure on the Washtenaw County Board of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Kathleen Stroud for her lifetime of service on behalf of Washtenaw County and its residents. Ms. Stroud has been a key figure in fighting for social justice throughout her career.

SAVANNAH PRIDE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Savannah Pride for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Savannah Pride is a student at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Savannah Pride is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Savannah Pride for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

MICHAEL KINDER & SONS 125TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this year a family owned and operated construction company in northeast Indiana is celebrating its 125th year in business. Since 1892, Michael Kinder & Sons, owned and operated by the Kinder family, has been working on planning, designing, and building projects in and around Fort Wayne, Indiana. A company that began with just three construction workers and an old mule has grown to become a leading regional construction firm. Over the years, Michael Kinder & Sons has completed thousands of projects and transformed skylines across northeast Indiana. The Michael Kinder & Sons team has constructed important industrial facilities, houses of worship, health-care facilities, senior-care residences, college campuses, and commercial buildings. The company has made it a point to support local charities and has offered leadership to local nonprofit, education, and faith-based boards. Guided by its motto—''We will serve our clients' needs—no matter how large or small—by providing quality services in the commercial and industrial marketplace''—Michael Kinder & Sons has been an important part of northeast Indiana's fabric for 125 years. I congratulate the entire Michael Kinder & Sons team on their success and wish them many prosperous years ahead.

TRIBUTE FOR REMINGTON J. PETERS

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share my most sincere appreciation for the life and service of Navy Petty Officer First Class Remington J. Peters. He was tragically taken from this world at the young age of 27 over the Memorial Day weekend.

Remi was born and raised in Grand Junction, Colorado, where he was known by his friends to be a loving, caring and passionate young man who brought a smile to everyone's face. His parents described him as an angel on earth. After Remi graduated from Grand Junction High School, he found his calling in the U.S. Navy. He entered SEAL school and graduated without difficulty.

During his distinguished time in the Navy, Remi was assigned to the SEAL's prestigious Leap Frogs, the Navy's parachute demonstration team. Remi performed over 900 jumps, most of them at public gatherings in front of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

As a Navy SEAL, Remi risked his life every time he stepped foot on a ship or helicopter. Remi accepted the dangers of two combat tours and hundreds of jumps in order to serve his country.

Mr. Speaker, at only 27 years old, Remi had an impressive list of accomplishments. I hope as his family and friends commemorate his life, they are continually reminded of what an extraordinary individual he was. Remi will forever be remembered in his hometown of Grand Junction, and by so many who came to know him over the years. I continue to pray for comfort for Remi's family and friends during this difficult time, and I know that the memory of Remington J. Peters will live on in all who share his story.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. LAMAR BALL

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of former First State Bank executive, Lamar Ball, who passed away on March 26, 2017. Mr. Ball was known for his commitment to his family and his leadership in the Denton banking community. He was a skilled visionary who saved First State Bank from potential closure immediately after assuming the role of chairman and CEO in October 1989.

A Tennessee native, Mr. Ball graduated from the University of Tennessee in Knoxville in 1962. Long before he led First State Bank, Mr. Ball began his working life measuring cotton crops straight out of college. After a full year of such work, he decided he needed a change. The only requirement for his next job, according to his daughter Allison, was that it be indoors, so Mr. Ball accepted a banking job in Atlanta and embarked on a banking career that would endure more than 30 years.

To Mr. Ball, his legacy was important. According to his son David, ''His legacy was not the material things he gained; his legacy was his children and grandchildren, and he made sure [they] knew that.'' Mr. Ball was an accomplished and influential banker, but more importantly, he was a loving and dedicated parent and grandparent. He will be greatly missed. I include in the RECORD an article that appeared in The Denton Record-Chronicle.

LAMAR BALL, FORMER EXEC AT FIRST STATE BANK, DIES AT AGE 76

(Jenna Duncan, Staff Writer)

Lamar Ball, a devoted father, grandfather and a staple in the Denton banking community, died Sunday after a battle with myelodysplastic syndrome, a blood disorder that can lead to cancer. He was 76.

Ball was known in Denton for saving First State Bank. He started in October 1989 as chairman and CEO and quickly stopped the bank from losing money and facing closure. He brought in investor Carl Pohlad, who at the time owned the major league baseball team Minnesota Twins, and rebuilt the company, former colleagues said.

''His mission was to raise capital to quite frankly save the bank and he did, so in my mind he saved First State Bank of Texas,'' said Bill Bonds, who served as chief financial officer under Ball. ''He was a visionary. He told me one time that he loved to create worth. His greatest skill was finding or taking something that was broken and turning it into something valuable.''

The Tennessee native graduated from the University of Tennessee in Knoxville in 1962 and immediately got a job measuring cotton crops. His daughter, Allison Bertorelli, said his only specifications for what he wanted in his first job was that it would be indoors.

The next year, Ball switched to banking with a job in Atlanta and continued in the industry for more than 30 years.

One phrase he took to heart and would often repeat was, ''I might not be the smartest guy in the room, but I work harder than anyone in the room,'' said Glenn Monroe, a family friend turned colleague at First State in Denton. He was a fan of 6 a.m. meetings and didn't like doing check-ins with employees on a regular basis. A lot of times, Ball was also the smartest man in the room, Monroe said.

''You won't meet too many bankers at the executive level who are willing to make decisions and live with them,'' Monroe said. ''He was willing to listen to all of the information, listen to your input, and he'd make a decision. That would be it. If the decision wasn't the greatest one, he never came back on anyone else.''

A main reason Ball was able to build capital at First State was through acquiring smaller community banks in the area, then helping make them more profitable. By the time he left in the late 1990s, the bank had more than quadrupled its assets.

From there, he went on to invest and lead Smart Start, a company that creates alcohol detection technology for cars, and invested in other companies.

He worked a lot of late nights, his children said, but he made sure he could always coach a sports team for one of five children and never missed a game, Bertorelli said. He also loved the phrase ''Heck of a deal'' whenever one of his kids came to him with a tale of success.

Later in life, he continued that dedication to family with his 11 grandchildren. Each photo of him with one of grandchildren reveals a large, toothy grin with Ball's ears sticking out, his son, David Ball, said.

''His legacy was a big deal to him,'' David Ball said. ''His legacy was not the material things he gained; his legacy was his children and grandchildren, and he made sure we knew that.''

Ball is survived by his wife, Barbara Ball, his five children, a stepchild and 11 grandchildren. Visitation will be from 6 to 8 p.m. Wednesday at Bill DeBerry Funeral Directors, 2025 W. University Drive.

Funeral service will be at 11 a.m. Thursday at St. Andrew Presbyterian Church, 300 W. Oak St. in Denton.

SELENA MARTINEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Selena Martinez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Selena Martinez is a student at Arvada K–8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Selena Martinez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Selena Martinez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING MEGAFEST, THE NATION'S LARGEST FAITH, FILM, AND FAMILY MULTIDAY EXPERIENCE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize MegaFest which returns to Dallas this summer—June 28 through July 1. MegaFest has been built into the nation's largest celebration of life-changing events and empowering seminars focused on faith, inspiration, music, entertainment, youth and fun for the entire family, and praise for this event's success belongs to visionary leader Bishop T.D. Jakes.

MegaFest has captivated diverse audiences in Atlanta, GA; Dallas, TX; and Johannesburg, South Africa, since 2004. In 2015, over 90,000 attendees from around the world called Dallas ''home.'' With an expected attendance of over 100,000, support from the business community and key sponsors has helped Bishop Jakes, MegaFest, and the City of Dallas reach larger audiences and offer quality programs and entertainment.

A major theme of the event is based on the ''Conversations with America'' survey conducted by Bishop Jakes. The survey gauged America's thoughts, concerns, and views on today's most pressing issues, including gender equality, criminal justice reform, economic reform, and national security.

This year's results show a significant and consistent gap between men and women's views toward the current state of gender inequality across America. Equality for all is a central pillar of our democracy, and women, no matter their ethnicity, religious orientation, or socioeconomic status in the United States, should be treated as equals in all aspects of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Bishop Jakes on creating such a wonderful and progressive event. I wish MegaFest, and similar events, future success in uniting families and individuals from all over the world in the name of love, growth, and equality.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI ARMY NATIONAL GUARD SERGEANT (SGT) KYLE CLAYTON THOMAS

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Mississippi Army National Guard Sergeant (SGT) Kyle Clayton Thomas who paid the ultimate sacrifice while training to defend our great nation on May 29, 2017, at the National Training Center (NTC) at Fort Irwin, California. SGT Thomas died in a rollover accident while he and three other soldiers were conducting combat maneuver operations in a M1A2 SEPv2 Abrams Main Battle Tank. The soldiers with him were treated and released from Loma Linda University Medical Center in Loma Linda, California.

SGT Thomas, an Amory native and 2011 Amory High School graduate, was assigned to Company A, 2nd Battalion 198th Armored, 155th Armored Brigade headquartered in Tupelo, Mississippi.

SGT Thomas joined the Mississippi Army National Guard in 2012. His mother, Jo Ann Boussouar, says her son was always interested in the military. As a young boy, SGT Thomas would say that he wanted to be a tank driver. Her son was able to fulfill his dream to serve in the military, and she is proud of his willingness to sacrifice his life for the safety of his family.

''Kyle has a tattoo that said, 'For those I love, I will sacrifice,'" she said. ''That's what he did.''

SGT Thomas divided his time between his assembly job at NauticStar Boats manufacturing plant in Amory and the Mississippi Army National Guard. SGT Thomas's obituary describes him as a compassionate person who loved life and spending time with his family. It says when his daughter, Devina Jayde Smith, was born, an incredible bond was formed. SGT Thomas's father, Eddie Thomas, says the whole family is proud of SGT Thomas's commitment to his family and to the defense of our nation.

''I was very proud,'' Mr. Thomas said. ''His service made me feel wonderful.''

In a statement issued by the Department of the Army and Air Force, Colonel (COL) Doug Ferguson, Commander of the Tupelo-based 155th Armored Brigade Combat Team, expressed his sympathy over the loss of SGT Thomas.

''Our deepest sympathies go out to SGT Thomas's family and friends,'' said COL Ferguson. ''We have lost a valuable member of our team and this loss will be felt across the brigade.''

SGT Thomas's awards include the Meritorious Service Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Armed Forces Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Army Reserve Component Achievement Medal, Mississippi Magnolia Cross, Mississippi Emergency Service Medal, Mississippi Longevity Medal, and the Mississippi War Medal.

SGT Thomas died on Memorial Day—the day our nation sets aside to honor the service men and women who fought and died to protect the freedoms we all enjoy. We cannot forget what this national holiday means to families who have experienced that loss.

SGT Thomas is survived by a daughter, Devina Smith; parents, Eddie Thomas (Sheryl) and Jo Ann Boussouar (Hachemi); sisters, Joni Edmonson (David), Tiffany Jones; Chrystal Parker (Marty), and Jennifer Sloan (Robin); grandparents, Jackie Ann Wallace and Marvelle Jean Tartt; aunts, Janette West (Dan), Karen Wallace; uncles, Billy and Bobby Wallace; cousins, Danette Starks (William) and Allison Fair (Chris); nieces and nephews, Annalee Thomas, Alexis Jones, Olivia and Riley Edmonson, Dustin Parker (Brooke), Jake Sloan (Chastity), Lauren Sloan; special friends, Chandler Riggs, Bradley Riggs, Ryan Hill, Jessica Smith (mother of Devina), Hannah Zaragosa, and Courtlyn McCollum.

IN RECOGNITION OF AZERBAIJAN REPUBLIC DAY

HON. RANDY HULTGREN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Republic of Azerbaijan as it recently celebrated the 99th anniversary of Republic Day.

On May 28, 1918, the Azerbaijani National Council proclaimed the independence of Azerbaijan and the establishment of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. Thus, Azerbaijan became the first democratic parliamentary republic in the Muslim world.

Since that day nearly a century ago and especially over the last 25 years, the United States has striven to develop, grow, and enhance its relationship with Azerbaijan and the Azerbaijani people.

Azerbaijan is an ethnically diverse country where the predominately Muslim population coexists with Christian, Jewish, and other religious communities. The country has emerged as a leader in energy markets in the Caspian Region for several years now. The United States has long supported Azerbaijan's achievements and the United States seeks to maintain a strong bilateral economic relationship through the promotion of trade and investment.

The United States and Azerbaijan continue to foster a strong and sturdy partnership and cooperate on economic and security issues. Azerbaijan has taken critical steps toward working with the United States on counterterrorism efforts. The American people appreciate and are grateful for the solid bilateral relationship forged over the years with Azerbaijan.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Azerbaijan and its people on this the 99th anniversary commemorating Republic Day.

SERENITY GARCIA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Serenity Garcia for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Serenity Garcia is a student at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Serenity Garcia is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Serenity Garcia for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING GARY LETTERLY

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend Gary Letterly for his dedication to the agricultural community and congratulate him on his retirement after 25 years with University of Illinois Extension.

For nearly three decades, Gary has worked at the Extension office in Christian County, contributing to local economic development projects within the county. In this role, Gary was able to establish an Enterprise Zone along Route 29 and create ''Community Swaps'' which helped connect community leaders and elected officials to similarly-sized communities in the state as a way to help those officials learn and grow in their positions.

As his career progressed, Gary's unique specializations and insight helped to broaden the focus and expand the impact of the University of Illinois Extension Office. His broad range of skills greatly impacted the production of local row-crops as well as homeowner lawn and pest issues.

I am proud to recognize Mr. Letterly's work on behalf of the agricultural community and wish him all the best in his retirement.

HONORING HUBERT MILLS

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the world has changed much over the last 100 years. If you want to know just how much, ask Mr. Hubert Mills of Hot Springs, Arkansas. The year of Mr. Mills' birth was eventful—the U.S. faced uncertainty as President Woodrow Wilson prepared our nation for World War I, the Chicago White Sox won the world series, and the man who would become the 35th U.S. President, John F. Kennedy, was born.

In his 100 years of life, Mr. Mills saw America win two world wars and put a man on the moon. He has lived through the administrations of 18 presidents of the United States and experienced the American dream.

During 100 years, he has worked a variety of jobs from driving a sprinkler truck at the local race track at age 20 to working as a driver for Railway Express. But Mr. Mills made a name for himself building homes in the Hot Springs region, retiring at the age of 95, though he still does work for his many customers.

At 100-years-old, Mr. Mills is surrounded by many loved ones, including his three children, six grandchildren, and 11 great grandchildren. As Mr. Mills celebrates his 100th birthday on Friday, June 9, 2017, I would like to wish him a happy birthday.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED HEALTH FOUNDATION'S DIVERSE SCHOLARS INITIATIVE

HON. TIMOTHY J. WALZ

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, continuing to modernize the health care system requires improving the quality and delivery of health care, the backbone of which is our health workforce. I am proud to have the opportunity today to talk about a group of promising students from around the country. This year's United Health Foundation Diverse Scholars Initiative scholarship recipients represent 36 states, and they are some of the brightest individuals preparing to enter the health workforce.

They are working hard in their undergraduate, graduate and doctorate programs—whether they are studying to be physicians, nurses, dentists, or mental health providers—to increase the number of skilled professionals entering the health workforce. This is key to the future of our nation's health: we need a robust health care workforce in order to increase access to care in rural areas and across the nation.

Beyond their academic achievements, I would also like to recognize their commitment to making the health care system more culturally relevant and their dedication to improving the health outcomes of the individuals they will one day serve. Research shows that when people are treated by health professionals who share their language, culture, or ethnicity, they are more likely to accept and receive medical treatment. That is why these students will be a great asset to our nation's health care system.

Next week, these scholars will be joining us in Washington, D.C. to examine some of the nation's most urgent health care issues and potential solutions as part of the Diverse Scholars Forum. Celebrating its 10th anniversary this year, the United Health Foundation's Diverse Scholars Initiative has helped more than 2,000 multicultural students from across the country realize their dreams of pursuing careers in health while meeting the needs of local and underserved communities. This year, these scholars include a group of military spouses pursuing health careers who have received scholarships, and I would like to recognize their commitment to becoming part of the future health workforce and for their sacrifices and service to our nation.

To these exceptional scholars, congratulations and best wishes for success in all of your future endeavors. As a teacher, I'm proud to know that we have scholars like you who are ready to lead us into a new era of better and more efficient health care. I know that our nation's health care system will benefit from your hard work and talent.

Aviva Aguilar, Fatima Ahmad, Maria Alfaro, Sainfer Aliyu, Cesar Andrade, Austere Apolo, Shantrice Appleby, Janetci Arevalo, Melissa Avila, Kwame Awuku, Kane Banner, Cristina Batarse, Simone Batiste, Shanell Becenti, Asma Begum, Ashleigh Bennett, Michael Bervell, Carlene Black, Ashley Blackwell, Ruth Campos, Girah Caraballo, Suzanne Carvajal-Pinos, Danelle Cooper, Radha Dahal, Ana Maria De Leon, Angelica Duque, Marissa

Emadi, Rebecca Espinoza, Gerardo Flores, Clarissa Flores, Itzel Garcia Vasquez, Raffaella Garofanelli, Jeremy Garriga, Jashalynn German, Claudio Gonzalez, Paula-Ann Granston, Katie Haynes, Ray Hill, Shakura Howard, Wesley Hungbui, Ronald Ikech, Jalane Jara, Karianne Jones, Ramanjot Kaur, Leslie Kedelty, Cleo Klopfleisch, Vin Lay, Than Le, Amy Liang, Christine Loftis, Dylan Lopez, Quentin Loyd, Mabel Luo, Andrew Ly, Maria Madrigal, Alexann Masiko-Meyer, Beverley Mateo, Karen Mendez, Justin Mollison, Kimberley Mondestin, Christian Monsalve, Maria Moreno Valencia, Krista Morine, Egypt Muhammad, Marilyn Ndukwe, Ronke Olowojesiku, Chiemeka Onyima, Victoria Ordaz-Garcia, Laura Sofia Ortega Flores, Angelika Pasion, Sylvia Pena, Laura Penalo, Joshua Platero, Anna Quintanilla, Alejandro Rabionet, Grace Ramirez, Caesar Rangel, Kimyetta Robinson, Franklyn Rocha Cabrero, Victoria Rodriguez, Nancy Roque, Giovanni Rosas Escobedo, Leah Ruiz, Valeria Salazar Balli, Kelly Sanchez, Mariah Smith, Alcha Strane, Maylei Suen, Brenda Talamantes, Lisa Tu, Ifeanyi Uche, Best Uchehara, Madelyne Valdez, Jennifer Villalobos, Sebastian Villegas, Joaquin Villegas, Craig Washington, Veronica Williams, Davontae Willis, Bethany Womack, Chaoyan Yu, Ashley Zapata.

SHELBY SCHINDLER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Shelby Schindler for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Shelby Schindler is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Shelby Schindler is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Shelby Schindler for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, due to the birth of my first child I was unable to be present for votes taken May 18 through 19, 22, and 24 through 25, as well as for some votes on May 23. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call Vote Number 263 (Previous Question on H. Res. 324): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 264 (Passage of H. Res. 324): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 265 (Passage of H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 266 (Passage of H.R. 1892, the Honoring Hometown Heroes Act): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 267 (Passage of H.AMDT. 117 to H.R. 1039 offered by Rep. SHEILA JACKSON LEE): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 268 (Passage of H.R. 1039, the Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 269 (Passage of H.R. 1862, the Global Child Protection Act of 2017): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 270 (Passage of H.R. 1842, the Strengthening Children's Safety Act): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 273 (Passage of H.R. 2288, the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 274 (Motion to Table): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 275 (Previous Question on H. Res. 352): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 276 (Passage of H. Res. 352): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 277 (Passage of H.R. 2052, the Protecting the Rights of Individuals Against Technological Exploitation (PRIVATE) Act): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 278 (Passage of H.R. 467, the VA Scheduling Accountability Act): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 279 (Passage of H. AMDT. 118 to H.R. 953 offered by Rep. ELIZABETH ESTY): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 280 (Passage of H. AMDT. 119 to H.R. 953 offered by Rep. JARED HUFFMAN): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 281 (Motion to Recommit on H.R. 953): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 282 (Passage of H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 283 (Passage of H. AMDT 124 to H.R. 1761 offered by Rep. SHEILA JACKSON LEE): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 284 (Passage of H.R. 1761, the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act of 2017): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 285 (H.R. 1973, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act of 2017): YES.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 7, I joined the Vice President for an important event at Johnson Space Center in my congressional district. As a result, I missed the following recorded votes:

On roll call Number 288, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 374, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On roll call Number 289, agreeing to House Resolution 374, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On roll call Number 290, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 375, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On roll call Number 291, agreeing to House Resolution 375, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On roll call Number 292, the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.''

On roll call Number 293, passage of an amendment to H.R. 2213, had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

On roll call Number 294, passage of H.R. 2213, had I been present I would have voted ''yes.'' I am pleased that my colleagues in the House voted to pass the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017 that will enable the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to fulfill its duty to protect the American people by waiving specific pre-employment requirements for certain qualified candidates to make the hiring process more expedient. The CBP is currently understaffed below its congressionally mandated level and this bill will help alleviate this staffing shortage.

TRIBUTE TO MADELEINE BERMAN AND HER LATE HUSBAND, MANDELL BERMAN

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two remarkable people from my home state of Michigan, Madeleine Berman and her late husband, Mandell Berman. The Bermans are being honored by the Detroit Symphony Orchestra (DSO) at its seventh annual Heroes Gala on June 10, 2017 for their significant contributions to the DSO, which plays a vital role in the vibrant cultural fabric of Southeast Michigan.

For many of us privileged with the long and warm personal friendship with Madge and Bill Berman, who passed away at the age of 99 last December, this Heroes Gala provides the opportunity to give thanks for the blessings of their generosity to the DSO, as well as a very broad range of community interests.

In recognition of his leadership, Bill Berman was given the Russell G. Mawby Award by the Council of Michigan Foundations in 2012, and he was inducted into the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Madge Berman has served two terms on the President's Committee for the Arts, to which she was appointed by President Bill Clinton in 1994 and reappointed by President Barack Obama in 2009, and received the national Legacy Award from Americans for the Arts, which she has served as a board member since 1989.

Their passion for the arts and education truly came together in Bill and Madge's support for the DSO, particularly in their vision and support for its ''Live from Orchestra Hall: Classroom Edition'' program. Grounded in her background in music, communication and theater, Madge Berman wanted to find a way to use technology to help bring the experience of the orchestra to young people in Detroit who may otherwise not be exposed to it. She and Bill brought the idea to the leadership of the DSO, and ''Live from Orchestra Hall: Classroom Edition'' was born. This one of a kind webcast series aimed at youth is made available at no cost to every classroom in the Detroit Public Schools Community District, and students from throughout the United States and the world have experienced the beauty of orchestral music through its availability on the

DSO's website. A Teacher's Resource Guide is also available on the website to enable educators to create lessons accompanying the concerts.

With their devotion of time and financial resources, they have supported a wide array of organizations in the promotion of education, animal welfare, the arts, and hunger alleviation. Bill Berman was for nearly endless decades a uniquely inspirational force in the Jewish community. In education, he was co-founder of the Jewish Education Services of North America and funded the University of Michigan Hillel, which bears his name, as well as holding vital posts in a large number of Jewish organizations in Michigan and nationally. Combining their love of theater and Jewish education, Bill and Madge Berman founded the Berman Center for the Performing Arts at the Jewish Community Center in West Bloomfield, Michigan.

As Mark Davidoff, chairman of the DSO's board of directors, told the Detroit Jewish News, "What I learned from the Bermans is the art of stewardship. The manner in which they curated their financial and community commitments is a lesson for us all. They created a sustainable legacy in areas important to all of us, including community cohesion, education, and arts and culture."

When the Detroit Symphony Orchestra performs, from Beethoven to Gershwin, on Saturday, June 10 at the Heroes Concert and Gala, it will indeed be sounding fervent notes of tribute to two true heroes.

SIERRA GIFFORD

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sierra Gifford for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sierra Gifford is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sierra Gifford is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sierra Gifford for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF NANCY ZIRKIN

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the bold visionary leadership of Nancy Zirkin, who is retiring as Executive Vice President and Director of Policy at the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

It has been my privilege to work with Nancy for three decades, and to witness first-hand her relentless commitment to justice and opportunity for hard working families. Every day, with every fight she has championed the civil, human and economic rights of those all too often left behind in America.

Nancy Zirkin retires with a towering legacy of legislative achievement to her credit. At the Leadership Conference, Nancy was instrumental in the passage of the ADA Amendments of 2008, the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 and the historic Dodd-Frank Wall Street consumer financial protections law.

Before that, Nancy was the Director of Public Policy and Government Relations at the American Association for University Women, where she worked on the ERA ratification and the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Nancy knows how to bring diverse players together, from the Chamber of Commerce to the civil rights community, to secure progress in the lives of the American people. She has been an invaluable leader, coordinating legislative campaigns that win over the last decade. She is tireless and forceful—and she won't accept no for an answer.

Beyond her professional service, Nancy is a promoter of countless women running for office and a devoted grandmother. She is a civic leader and with her husband Harold, a dedicated philanthropist on causes from childhood hunger to access to medical care for all.

On behalf of her many friends in Congress on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol, and as a fellow proud daughter of Baltimore, I commend Nancy Zirkin on a lifetime of transformational public service. As she begins this new chapter of her life, I wish her well in all her future endeavors.

A COMPREHENSIVE PROACTIVE CYBERSECURITY STRATEGY

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, World War III is raging in cyber space right now. It has become one of the most crucial homeland and global security issues.

In May, there was a global cyberattack—most likely by the North Koreans—that was reported to have hit 200,000 computers in more than 150 countries.

Last year, our Presidential elections came under cyber attack, possibly compromising the American electoral system. According to a January report of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, "Russian efforts to influence the 2016 presidential election represent the most recent expression of Moscow's long-standing desire to undermine the US-led liberal democratic order." The United States is not alone. There were press reports of a massive cyber hack of French President Emmanuel Macron's campaign.

This is an issue that impacts the security of the United States and our allies. We cannot wait for the next attack. Instead, we must have a comprehensive, proactive cybersecurity strategy. That is why I am introducing legislation today.

First, my legislation will call on the Department of Defense to update its cyber strategy. Second, it will require the President to draft a strategy for offensive cyber capabilities. Finally, it authorizes international cooperation, including building up NATO partner cyber capabilities.

My legislation will increase our offensive cyber abilities to help prevent our adversaries from engaging in the types of cyber espionage we witnessed during the past election and in recent global cyber attacks. Protecting our networks is vital to the security of our nation and allies, and my legislation works towards that end.

TRIBUTE TO ROSE ALLSTON WOODSIDE

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me as I rise to pay tribute to Mrs. Rose Allston Woodside, and the many contributions she made as a dedicated community member of Newark, New Jersey.

Born and raised in Newark, New Jersey, Mrs. Woodside is a long-time, exemplary resident of Newark's Central Ward. She lived in Newark for 89 years, where she made an amazing impact on her community. As a young woman living on Hillside Place in Newark in the 1940s, she was a wonderful ballroom dancer and participated in local lindy hop dances at Newark's Kruger Auditorium. She received her high school diploma from South Side High School which laid the foundation for a successful career in the secretarial and stenography field. She contributed her service as an Executive Assistant at the Newark Housing Authority (NHA) for over 30 years. At the NHA, she became a founding member of the Local 305 Service Employees International Union, and served as its Corresponding Secretary.

Mrs. Woodside's love for her community is unquestioned as she spent much of her time engaging in many civic and community activities. She was a founding member of The Lomars, a Newark social club, which supported the candidacy of Newark's first African American mayor, Kenneth Gibson. In addition, she was an officer and member of the Board of Directors of the High Park Garden housing cooperative in Newark's Central Ward.

Mrs. Woodside has been an amazing member of the St. James A.M.E. Church for 71 years. In her church she served for over 20 years, as a member and officer of the Marie B. Moses Scholarship Committee for over 20 years, which provided college scholarships for high school students. Also, Mrs. Woodside loved to travel. She has visited several countries. including South Africa, which she visited four times. Her love to experience different cultures transpired through her work as a member of the Experienced Seniors Club, where she helped to plan trips and cultural events for other senior citizens living in Newark. Furthermore, for many years she was a

poll worker in Newark's Central Ward. At 90, her hobby consists of making beautifully designed tissue boxes for family members and friends.

Throughout her time in Newark, she developed special bonds with many members of her community including with Mayor Baraka's grandmother, who she was best friends with. Not only is Mrs. Woodside a cherished resident of Newark, she is also a beloved mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother.

Mr. Speaker, I know my fellow members of the U.S. House of Representatives agree that Mrs. Rose Allston Woodside deserves to be recognized for a job well done and for many years of service to the Newark community.

SOPHIE OSCAR

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sophie Oscar for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sophie Oscar is a student at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sophie Oscar is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sophie Oscar for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 8, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense budget posture in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD–G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Justice.

SD–192

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Kevin Allen Hassett, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and Pamela Hughes Patenaude, of New Hampshire, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

SD–538

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 and revenue proposals.

SD–608

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the effectiveness of existing Federal permitting processes, compare and contrast Federal permitting and state permitting, and examine how Federal permitting can be improved.

SD–366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, Annie Caputo, of Virginia, and David Wright, of South Carolina, each to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Susan Parker Bodine, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD–406

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of State.

SD–419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the cost of prescription drugs, focusing on how the drug delivery system affects what patients pay.

SD–430

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Agriculture.

SD–124

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of State.

SD–192

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Transportation.

SD–138

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR–222

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy

To hold hearings to examine state-sponsored cyberspace threats, focusing on recent incidents and United States policy response.

SD–419

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 1250, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, S. 1275, to improve the housing conditions and promote useful land uses within tribal communities, and an original bill entitled, ''HUD/VA Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing''.

SD–628

JUNE 14

9:30 a.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine the Romanian anti-corruption process, focusing on successes and excesses.

SVC–212–210

9:45 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Kenneth Bush, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kevin Christopher Newsom, of Alabama, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, and Damien Michael Schiff, of California, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

SD–226

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine paving the way for self-driving vehicles.

SR–253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine S. 517, to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid vapor pressure limitations under such Act.

SD–406

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine ideology and terror, focusing on understanding the tools, tactics, and techniques of violent extremism.

SD–342

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense.
SD–192

11 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Legislative Branch
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Senate Sergeant at Arms and the Capitol Police.
SD–124

2 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Water and Power
To hold hearings to examine S. 440, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, S. 677, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, S. 685, to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the States of Montana and North Dakota, S. 930, to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, S. 1012, to provide for drought preparedness measures in the State of New Mexico, S. 1029, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to exempt certain small hydroelectric power projects that are applying for relicensing under the Federal Power Act from the licensing requirements of that Act, and S. 1030, to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to submit to Congress a report on certain hydropower projects.
SD–366

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the National Nuclear Security Administration.
SD–138

Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for veterans' programs and fiscal year 2019 advance appropriations requests.
SR–418

Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine military caregivers, focusing on families serving for the long run.
SD–106

3 p.m.
Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine tax reform, focusing on removing barriers to small business growth.
SR–428A

JUNE 15

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SD–G50

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Forest Service.
SD–366

JUNE 20

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of the Interior.
SD–366

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining
To hold hearings to examine collaborative initiatives, focusing on restoring watersheds and large landscapes across boundaries through state and Federal partnerships.
SD–366

JUNE 22

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Energy.
SD–366

JUNE 27

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Labor.
SD–138

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3301–S3344

Measures Introduced: Seventeen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1298–1314, and S. Res. 185–187. **Pages S3327–28**

Measures Reported:

S. 286, to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado. (S. Rept. No. 115–92) **Page S3327**

Measures Passed:

Lions Clubs International 100th Anniversary: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 174, recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S3342–43**

Tillis (for Moran) Amendment No. 222, to remove references to specific entities. **Pages S3342–43**

Congratulating Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory: Senate agreed to S. Res. 187, congratulating and honoring Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory on 50 years of groundbreaking discoveries. **Page S3343**

Measures Considered:

Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights. **Pages S3303–21**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 91 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. 140), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Pages S3309–10**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, post-cloture, at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, June 8, 2017; and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business and Leader remarks count post-cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S3343**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Ryan McCarthy, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

Patrick M. Shanahan, of Washington, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Jeffrey Bossert Clark, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Allison H. Eid, of Colorado, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

Ralph R. Erickson, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

Dabney Langhorne Friedrich, of California, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Timothy J. Kelly, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Trevor N. McFadden, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Stephen S. Schwartz, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Michael P. Allen, of Florida, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims for the term of fifteen years.

Amanda L. Meredith, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims for the term of fifteen years.

Joseph L. Toth, of Wisconsin, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims for the term of fifteen years. **Page S3344**

Messages from the House: **Page S3327**

Measures Referred: **Page S3327**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S3327**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3327**

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S3328–29

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S3329–39

Additional Statements: Pages S3325–27

Amendments Submitted: Pages S3339–41

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S3341–42

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—140) Page S3310

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:47 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 8, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3343.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: FOREST SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the USDA Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Tom Tidwell, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS: ARMY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Army, after receiving testimony from Robert M. Speer, Acting Secretary of the Army, and General Mark A. Milley, USA, Chief of Staff of the Army, both of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: NRC

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, after receiving testimony from Kristine L. Svinicki, Chairman, and Jeff Baran and Stephen G. Burns, both a Commissioner, all of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS: HUD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, after receiving testimony from Ben Carson, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

APPROPRIATIONS: LOC AND AOC

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Library of Congress and the Architect of the Capitol, after receiving testimony from Carla Hayden, Librarian of Congress; and Stephen T. Ayers, Architect of the Capitol.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine Department of Defense nuclear acquisition programs and the nuclear doctrine, after receiving testimony from James A. MacStravic, performing the duties of Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Robert M. Soofer, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy, General Robin Rand, USAF, Commander, Air Force Global Strike Command, and Vice Admiral Terry J. Benedict, USN, Director, Strategic Systems Programs, all of the Department of Defense.

NOMINATION

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization, focusing on administration perspectives, after receiving testimony from Elaine L. Chao, Secretary of Transportation.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE WORKPLACE ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine working to improve the National Park Service workplace environment, after receiving testimony from Michael T. Reynolds, Acting Director, National Park Service, and Mary L. Kendall, Deputy Inspector General, both of the Department of the Interior; and Maria Burks, Coalition to Protect America's National Parks, Wellfleet, Massachusetts.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and

Human Services, and David Malpass, of New York, to be an Under Secretary, Andrew K. Maloney, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary, and Brent James McIntosh, of Michigan, to be General Counsel, all of the Department of the Treasury, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to Japan, Department of State.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, who was introduced by Senator Hatch, and Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director, both of the Office of Management and Budget, and Brock Long, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

VETERANS CHOICE PROGRAM

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Veterans Choice Program and the future of care in the community, after receiving testimony from David J. Shulkin, Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and Jeff Steele, The American Legion, Adrian Atizado, Disabled American Veterans, Carlos Fuentes, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and Gabriel Stultz, Paralyzed Veterans of America, all of Washington, D.C.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, after receiving testimony from Daniel R. Coats, Director of National Intelligence; Michael Rogers, Director, National Security Agency; and Rod J. Rosenstein, Deputy Attorney General, and Andrew McCabe, Acting Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, both of the Department of Justice.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 28 public bills, H.R. 2795–2822; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 377, were introduced. **Pages H4700–01**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4702–03**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 2353, to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–164). **Page H4700**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Johnson (LA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4651**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:57 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4657**

Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development—Reappointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development: Representative Ben Ray Luján (NM). **Page H4660**

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Capuano announced his intent to offer a privileged resolution. **Pages H4672–73**

Financial CHOICE Act of 2017—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 375, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 291, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 185 nays, Roll No. 290. **Pages H4664–71, H4673–74**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library: H. Con. Res. 33, designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library. **Pages H4674–76**

Unanimous Consent Agreement: Agreed by unanimous consent that the question of adopting amendment number 1 to H.R. 2213 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule 20. **Page H4677**

Question of Privilege: Representative Capuano rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted a resolution. The Chair ruled that the resolution did not present a question of the privileges of the House. Subsequently, Representative Capuano appealed the ruling of the chair and Representative McCaul moved to table the appeal. Agreed to the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 186 nays with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 292. **Pages H4684–86**

Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017: The House passed H.R. 2213, to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, by a recorded vote of 282 ayes to 137 noes, Roll No. 294. **Pages H4676–84, H4687–88**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. **Page H4676**

Rejected:

Michelle Lujan Grisham (NM) amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–162) that sought to prohibit the bill from going into effect until (1) the CBP completes its evaluation and pilot program of the Test for Espionage, Sabotage, and Corruption (TES–C) which is then certified by the DHS Inspector General and reported to Congress and (2) the DHS Inspector General completes a risk assessment of the population that could receive waivers and certifies to Congress that providing waivers to these individuals would not endanger national security, undermine workforce integrity, or increase corruption in the agency (by a yea-and-nay vote of 179 yeas to 238 nays, Roll No. 293). **Pages H4683–84, H4687**

H. Res. 374, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2213) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 289, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 288. **Pages H4660–64, H4671–72**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H4660.

Senate Referral: S. 1094 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4671, H4672, H4673, H4674, H4686, H4687, and H4688. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

Committee Meetings

THE NEXT FARM BILL: THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL FOOD AID AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Next Farm Bill: The Future of International Food Aid and Agricultural Development''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Labor. Testimony was heard from Alexander Acosta, Secretary, Department of Labor.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Science Foundation. Testimony was heard from France Cordova, Director, National Science Foundation.

FISCAL YEAR 2018 PRIORITIES AND POSTURE OF MISSILE DEFEAT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2018 Priorities and Posture of Missile Defeat Programs and Activities''. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General James Dickinson, Commander, Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense, U.S. Strategic Command, and Commander, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command/Army Strategic Forces Command; Todd Harvey, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities, Department of

Defense; Barry Pike, Program Executive Officer, U.S. Army Missiles and Space; and Vice Admiral James Syring, U.S. Navy, Director, Missile Defense Agency.

COMBAT AVIATION MODERNIZATION PROGRAMS AND THE FISCAL YEAR 2018 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing entitled ''Combat Aviation Modernization Programs and the Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request''. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Arnold W. Bunch, Military Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition; Lieutenant General Jon M. Davis, Deputy Commandant for Aviation, Headquarters Marine Corps; Vice Admiral Paul Grosklags, Commander, Naval Air Systems Command; Lieutenant General Jerry D. Harris, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Plans and Requirements, Headquarters U.S. Air Force; and Rear Admiral Upper Half Dewolfe Miller III, Director, Air Warfare Division, U.S. Navy.

THE ECONOMIC AND FISCAL BENEFITS OF PRO-GROWTH POLICIES

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Economic and Fiscal Benefits of Pro-Growth Policies''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 338, to promote a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce; H.R. 627, the ''Streamlining Energy Efficiency for Schools Act of 2017''; H.R. 723, the ''Energy Savings Through Public-Private Partnerships Act of 2017''; H.R. 1109, to amend section 203 of the Federal Power Act; H.R. 446, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project; H.R. 447, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project; H.R. 951, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project; H.R. 2122, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Jennings Randolph Dam; H.R. 2274, the ''HYPE Act''; H.R. 2292, to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonsville Dam; H.R. 2457, the ''J. Bennett Johnston Waterway Hydropower Extension Act of 2017''; H.R. 1222, the ''Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2017''; H.R. 1492, the ''Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017''; H.R. 2410, the ''Sickle Cell Disease Research, Surveillance, Prevention, and Treatment Act of 2017''; and H.R. 2430, the ''FDA Reauthorization Act of 2017''. H.R. 338, H.R. 627, H.R. 1109, H.R. 446, H.R. 447, H.R. 951, H.R. 2122, H.R. 2274, H.R. 2292, H.R. 1492, and H.R. 2410 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 2430, H.R. 723, H.R. 2457, H.R. 1222 were ordered reported, as amended.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM: A TAXPAYER'S PERSPECTIVE

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Flood Insurance Reform: A Taxpayer's Perspective''. Testimony was heard from Rebecca Kagan Sternhell, Deputy Director, General Counsel, Office of Federal Affairs, City of New York, Office of the Mayor; and public witnesses.

ENERGY OPPORTUNITIES IN NORTH AMERICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled ''Energy Opportunities in North America''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY REAUTHORIZATION AND THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2018 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Department of Homeland Security Reauthorization and the President's FY 2018 Budget Request''. Testimony was heard from John F. Kelly, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON THE OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT'S ABANDONED MINE LANDS PROGRAM

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Oversight Hearing on the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement's Abandoned Mine Lands Program''. Testimony was heard from Glenda Owens, Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior; Todd Parfitt, Director, Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality; Rob Rice, Chief, West Virginia Office of Abandoned Mine Lands and Reclamation; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 1074, to repeal the Act entitled ''An Act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation''; H.R. 1901, the ''Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium Land

Transfer Act of 2017''; and S. 249, to provide that the pueblo of Santa Clara may lease for 99 years certain restricted land, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from Bruce Loudermilk, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

FAST AND FURIOUS, SIX YEARS LATER

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Fast and Furious, Six Years Later''. Testimony was heard from Senator Grassley; John Dodson, Special Agent, Phoenix Field Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives; and public witnesses.

BUILDING A 21ST CENTURY INFRASTRUCTURE FOR AMERICA: COAST GUARD SEA, LAND, AND AIR CAPABILITIES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled ''Building a 21st Century Infrastructure for America: Coast Guard Sea, Land, and Air Capabilities''. Testimony was heard from Vice Admiral Charles W. Ray, Deputy Commandant for Operations, U.S. Coast Guard; Vice Admiral Sandra L. Stosz, Deputy Commandant for Mission Support, U.S. Coast Guard; Marie A. Mak, Director, Acquisition Sourcing and Management Team, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

OVERCOMING PTSD: ASSESSING VA'S EFFORTS TO PROMOTE WELLNESS AND HEALING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Overcoming PTSD: Assessing VA's Efforts to Promote Wellness and Healing''. Testimony was heard from Harold Kudler M.D., Acting Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Patient Care Services, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE HEARING ON PROMOTING INTEGRATED AND COORDINATED CARE FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Medicare Advantage Hearing on Promoting Integrated and Coordinated Care for Medicare Beneficiaries''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Commerce, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine fostering economic growth, focusing on the role of financial institutions in local communities, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Derek Kan, of California, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, David J. Redl, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, and Robert L. Sumwalt III, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine cost reductions in emerging energy technologies with a specific focus on how recent trends may affect today's energy landscape, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018, 9:45 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine ISIS's global reach beyond Iraq and Syria, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 782, to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and the nominations of Noel J. Francisco, of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States, and Makan Delrahim, of California, Steven Andrew Engel, of the District of Columbia, and Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, each to be an Assistant Attorney General, all of the Department of Justice, David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho, Scott L. Palk, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, Vishal J. Amin, of Michigan, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President, and Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold hearings to examine certain intelligence matters relating to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 1 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Nutrition, hearing entitled ''The Next Farm Bill: SNAP Technology and Modernization'', 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of the Interior, 9:30 a.m., 2007 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 10:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled ''Disrupter Series: Improving Consumer's Financial Options with FinTech'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Examining the Role of the Department of Health and Human Services in Health Care Cybersecurity'', 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance, hearing entitled ''Virtual Currency: Financial Innovation and National Security Implications'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Attacking Hezbollah's Financial Network: Policy Options'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security, hearing entitled ''How Can the United States Secret Service Evolve to Meet the Challenges Ahead?'', 2 p.m., HVC–210.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Library of Congress' Information Technology Management'', 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Oversight of Department of Justice Grant Programs'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing entitled ''A Time to Reform: Oversight of the Activities of the Justice Department's Civil, Tax and Environment and Natural Resources Divisions and the U.S. Trustee Program'', 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Power and Oceans, hearing on H.R. 2083, the ''Endangered Salmon and Fisheries Predation Prevention Act''; and legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing entitled ''Burdensome Litigation and Federal Bureaucratic Roadblocks to Manage our Nation's Overgrown, Fire-Prone National Forests'', 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Space, hearing entitled ''An Overview of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Budget for Fiscal Year 2018'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on the ''American Space Commerce Free Enterprise Act of 2017'', 1:30 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Building a 21st Century Infrastructure for America: Federal Aviation Administration Authorization'', 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''VA and Academic Affiliates: Who's Benefiting Now?'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing entitled ''Improving the Quality and Timeliness of GI Bill Processing for Student Veterans'', 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Department of Health and Human Services' Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request'', 1 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine economic aspects of the opioid crisis, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 8

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 722, Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act, post-cloture.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, June 8

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 10—Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Babin, Brian, Tex., E775, E782
Banks, Jim, Ind., E779
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E777
Buchanan, Vern, Fla., E775
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E779
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E776, E777
Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E783
Davis, Rodney, Ill., E781
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E778
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E777
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E775
Hultgren, Randy, Ill., E781
Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E776
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E780
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E780
Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E775
Levin, Sander M., Mich., E782
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E778
Marino, Tom, Pa., E778
Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E783
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E783
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E776, E777, E777, E778, E779, E780, E781, E782, E783, E784
Renacci, James B., Ohio, E777
Rooney, Francis, Fla., E775, E776
Rouzer, David, N.C., E778
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E777
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E782
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E779
Veasey, Marc A., Tex., E776
Walz, Timothy J., Minn., E781
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E777
Westerman, Bruce, Ark., E781

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.