United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2018 No. 6

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 10, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ADRIAN SMITH 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 8, 2018, 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.

TAX BILL RAMIFICATIONS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the phrases one often hears is, ''I hate to say I told you so.'' And it is delivered with a feigned sincerity, but usually people actually like to say, ''I told you so.''

I must confess that I have some of those feelings myself, as repeatedly during the few hours the Ways and Means Committee met, rushing through the massive tax cut, the largest transfer of wealth in our Nation's history, which will be paid for on the backs of our children and grandchildren with increased debt and benefiting people who in the main don't need it—I said at the time that each week after this bill passed, if it did, we would have a series of embarrassing stories about mistakes and oversight and special interest provisions that were stuck into it.

Well, actually, the fact is that that was somewhat understated because we are seeing, literally, every day people understand what was tucked in the bill: mistakes, oversight, and special interest provisions.

For example, there is a provision in the bill that was, we were told, designed to help small craft brewers. That is important to me and the people I represent, and there is broad support for minor provisions that would be able to help them by reducing their tax liability. But the provision that ended up in the final bill has massive opportunities to benefit large producers—a little bit for small craft brewers, but for large, international distillers, an opportunity to reconfigure how they do business to take advantage of multiple opportunities for that tax break.

There was an article yesterday talking about how the tax rate for American companies that manufacture overseas, the tax on that activity will be half as much as if they were manufacturing in the United States, providing an incentive to offshore jobs at a time when most of us would like to make sure that it is, here at home, at least, a level playing field, not to disadvantage people manufacturing here at home.

And, of course, there is another story in today's Wall Street Journal, ''Tax Law's Effect Fuels Farm Outcry,'' because there was a provision inserted in the bill that would give farmers a more lucrative deduction when they sell agricultural products directly to farm cooperatives. There is a story about one gentleman in there who felt that this could put him out of business. It is going to sting large agribusinesses like Cargill and Archer Daniels Midland. The new provision could reshape parts of the agriculture economy and sharply reduce many farmers' taxes as well as scrambling these individual businesses.

John Power, a North Dakota accountant who was the accountant for the small grain operator who is going to be hammered, said: ''It is kind of hard to imagine they intended to make farming tax free. Fixing it becomes difficult because they don't think it's something that can be fixed with regulation.''

There are a variety of these provisions that are a result of not following what we call ''regular order,'' without having hearings on the provision, of allowing lobbyists and staff to be able to draft the bill on the fly without having members of the committee—not just Democrats, but Republicans—fully know what was in it. That is legislative malpractice. It is one of the reasons why, despite giving over $3 trillion of tax cuts, the bill remains unpopular.

Americans are nervous about increasing our national debt over $2 trillion, and they know that the benefits for average citizens are going to go away in a few years and some are actually going to see tax increases, but the benefits for the top 1 percent and the largest corporations are permanent.

People know that it is not fair, that it is unnecessary, and that it is going to have more and more problems here, not just in States like mine where citizens are no longer going to be able to fully deduct their State and local taxes, property taxes, resulting in significant inequity, in scrambling property values, not just in Oregon, but it is across the country where people are going to be facing these problems.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

CELEBRATING PASSAGE OF THE TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 10 years since the Great Recession officially began, when our economy slumped and unemployment climbed to levels not witnessed since the early 1980s, but last month Congress paved the way to create a tax system that is fair, simpler, and one that establishes an environment where our country can unleash our full potential.

Too many Americans are living paycheck to paycheck and have been for too long. Stagnant wages, growing debt, and the inability to save have plagued so many. That is why our tax overhaul is so important. This truly is a once-in-a-generation opportunity that we could not afford to pass up.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will touch every household in the Nation and every corner of our economy. As soon as February, Americans will see more money in their paychecks. When it comes time to file their 2018 taxes, our tax system will be so simple that 9 out of 10 Americans will be able to file on a postcard. The standard deduction will be doubled for individuals and joint filers. Middle class families will also have a significant increase to the child tax credit to help parents with the costs of raising children.

And, Mr. Speaker, for those pursuing opportunity through education, America's students, the graduate tuition voucher exemption and student loan interest deduction remain in our tax reform package. I, and many of my colleagues, urged the conference committee to keep these provisions intact.

Our Tax Code should provide incentives for greater opportunity. For many, this is realized through higher education. The student loan interest deduction helps make higher education more affordable, and based on the most recent yearly data available, 12 million taxpayers benefited from that deduction.

I advocated keeping this provision as well as the graduate tuition voucher exemption and other higher education tax credits as a part of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act because they truly do make a difference in the lives of so many Americans. It makes financing an education possible for many low- and middle-income individuals.

In addition to education, another great cornerstone of the American Dream is homeownership, and, proudly, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will continue to provide tax relief to current and aspiring homeowners alike.

Mr. Speaker, there are many accomplishments in this historic tax overhaul, including lowering the corporate tax rate, which will put our job creators on a level playing field with their global competitors. This has already led to increased bonuses and pay raises for millions of workers. Quite simply, this bill provides the kind of tax relief that Americans deserve.

We challenged the status quo and the special interests who said it couldn't be done, and we did it. And the American people won.

CELEBRATING MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., DAY

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the upcoming holiday remembering Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

As a lifelong activist fighting for immigrants, civil and human rights, and now as a Member of Congress, Dr. King has been a deep and central inspiration throughout my life. His work has helped me to make possible the path that I have taken, from being a 16-year-old immigrant girl who came to this country by herself for college, to serving, now, as the first Indian-American woman elected to the United States House of Representatives—and it is the courage and the fight of Dr. King that made my journey possible.

I knew of Dr. King first because of his connection to Mahatma Gandhi, a great leader from my own birth country of India. Like Gandhi, Dr. King was a once-in-a-generation leader. Like Gandhi, the problems that Dr. King tackled were once seen as insurmountable problems, institutional barriers of race and class that seemed as if, if taken on, would topple society as we knew it, tall walls of tradition and practice that kept our society segregated and divided.

But that did not stop him from speaking out, organizing, and leading a growing movement that reminded the leaders of our country of the very dream that made America possible: that all men and women were created equal and that we should be judged by the content of our character and not the color of our skin.

Dr. King's gift was in his unique ability to bring truth, compassion, and justice together for a better future and to remind us of how much we share even across our differences. He followed Gandhi's principles of nonviolent resistance, also known as satyagraha: ''satya'' meaning truth, and ''graha'' meaning adherence to truth.

Satyagraha then meant insistence on truth, and that is what Dr. King preached and acted upon: truth about ending segregation and discrimination, truth about ending the war in Vietnam, truth about lifting up sanitation workers and ending poverty, truth, ultimately, that it is love and not hate that builds our character and our collective society.

If Dr. King were here with us today, he would call on us to have faith in our fight for justice and to substitute courage for caution. He would call on us to work passionately and unrelentingly for the very vision of our country that inspires so many around the world, for that more perfect Union that we know is still ahead of us, for that society that remembers that we are all better off when we are all better off.

Dr. King would remind us that justice is what love looks like in public. He would call on us to move into that plane of higher education, that plane of moral consciousness where we simply cannot stand by as injustice occurs around us.

He would call on us to address economic inequality by raising the minimum wage and enacting real tax reform whose benefits accrue to the masses and not to the top 1 percent and the wealthiest corporations.

Dr. King would call on us to pass the Dream Act and support the futures of 1.5 million young people across the country. He would call on us to expand and support the Affordable Care Act and healthcare for everyone so that no one is one healthcare crisis away from bankruptcy.

Our work is still to fight for justice and build that beloved community where each of us has a place to stand regardless of the color of our skin or where we live or how much money we have in our pockets, and in this beloved community, we would tackle the legacies of racism and implicit bias that we all carry with us with courage and with fortitude. We would work together to build that community that inspires us and to leave a world to our children that makes us proud, and, most importantly, we operate always from a place of generosity and abundance rather than fear and scarcity.

From that jail cell in Alabama, Dr. King wrote: ''We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny,'' or, as the great civil rights leader Reverend Joseph Lowery once said to me during the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride: ''We may have come over on different ships, but we are all in the same boat now.''

To make a difference, to truly serve the people, it only takes courage and coming together as a collective, across the aisle, across rural and urban, across Black, White, and Brown. Dr. King showed us what that really looks like, and he died because he was compelled to stand for making a reality from a dream of what was possible only in a country as great as the United States of America.

Today, as we remember and honor Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., we remember, too, that if we are courageous, if we put people over politics, our actions have the power to change lives, to push that moral arc of the universe more quickly towards justice. As Dr. King said: ''We must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back.''

□ 1015

CONGRESSMAN TIBERI'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, it has truly been the most remarkable honor to serve the people of Ohio's 12th Congressional District in central Ohio.

It all started in 1999, on my parents' front porch, the house that I grew up in, in a middle class neighborhood in Columbus called Forest Park. There, as the son of Italian immigrants, I learned how blessed I truly was to be an American; first in my family to graduate from high school, to go to high school, work my way through college at The Ohio State University.

See, my mom and dad believed that America was an incredible opportunity. With hard work and a good education, you could do anything. With their sacrifices and their hard work, I am here before you today, and for their sacrifices, I am forever grateful.

Leaving this Congress was not an easy decision. The speech that I made in 1999, on their front porch, still holds true today, the reason why I ran, to help those constituents, not only help them here in Washington, but help them cut through the red tape, to help that veteran, to help that widow on Social Security.

But leaving was important for my family. It was important to support them, to be with them more. My colleagues understand that. The sacrifices that we make, they make more. We put our names on the ballot, our spouses don't, our children don't.

To my colleagues, thank you for your friendship, your mentorship, and, certainly, your wisdom over the years. I will miss you.

To my supporters, who spent countless hours knocking on doors, putting up signs, going on bus tours, I couldn't have done it without you. Thank you.

To my team, both back in Ohio and here in D.C., both past and present, thank you for helping me serve and succeed for the people of Ohio's 12th District.

The late, great Woody Hayes said: ''You win with people.'' You are my people, and we have won together so many battles. I could not have done this without you. Forever Team Tiberi you all will be.

Most importantly, for my wife, Denice; our four daughters, Angelina, Cristina, Daniela, and Gabriela, thank you for all your support over the years. I will look forward to seeing you much more.

Finally, to the constituents of the 12th Congressional District, what an honor, a humbling honor, to serve you for the last 17 years. For a kid who grew up in Columbus, Ohio, in a middle class family, it has truly been an amazing journey. This speech is not goodbye; this speech is see you soon around the corner.

And to that, I wish you all the best here in the United States Congress. God bless you, and God bless America.

SHIELD OUR DREAMERS FROM DEPORTATION

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we will all certainly miss the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI). He is a wonderful Member, and we have enjoyed his service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, last night, a U.S. District Court Judge ordered the administration to continue accepting renewal applications for DACA recipients. Although this is welcome news, this should not undercut the urgency for us here in Congress to pass a permanent legislative solution to shield our DREAMers from deportation.

This week, I, again, had the great honor of meeting another great group of bright and hardworking young immigrants from my district whose DACA permits will expire in the coming weeks and the coming months. Despite their circumstances, despite living in fear and uncertainty about what their future holds, each one of these individuals has demonstrated great resolve and perseverance to continue the fight.

They visit Members of Congress, they share their unique stories, they provide the facts about their contributions in our communities, and they implore us to give them the opportunity to stay in what they consider to be their home, the United States.

Our DREAMers have suffered long enough, Mr. Speaker, and it is time that we act and take this issue to the finish line. Human lives are, indeed, at stake. Our DREAMers can't live from court decision to court decision.

As Congress has returned this week to begin our second session, I am here, once again, to urge us all to bring to the floor a legislative solution to give our DREAMers the opportunity to work here, to study here in this great country that they know as home. I am confident that we have the votes, Republicans and Democrats, for the House and the Senate to pass this permanent legislative fix. We can, and we must, make this happen now. Let us not wait any longer.

CELEBRATING THE GROUNDBREAKING FOR THE ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY GUS MACHADO SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate St. Thomas University as it breaks ground on January 24 on the new home for the Gus Machado School of Business. This new facility will empower St. Thomas University to continue its decades-long commitment to providing an excellent, yet affordable, business education to students in south Florida.

The new business school complex will include a state-of-the-art trading room, cybersecurity center, an entrepreneurship and innovation hub, and many other more exciting spaces. It will also empower the business school to offer 48 undergraduate and graduate degrees.

Most importantly, with its expanded classrooms and robust technology infrastructure, this new facility will keep St. Thomas at the forefront of business education and will enable the university to continue preparing new generations of south Florida business leaders.

I thank Gus Machado for his generous gift and every member of the St. Thomas family who has worked so hard to make this dream a reality.

RECOGNIZING THE LEGACY OF PARKER THOMSON

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Parker Thomson, a renowned attorney and civic leader from Miami who recently passed at the age of 85. Mr. Thomson was known for his work defending the First Amendment during his time with his law firm, Paul & Thomson.

Parker was a leader in advocating for our south Florida environment, involved in cases to protect the Everglades and our pristine beaches.

As the founding chair of the Miami-Dade Performing Arts Center Trust, Mr. Thomson helped lead the charge for the creation of the state-of-the-art Adrienne Arsht Center for the Performing Arts. Parker's commitment to his community was also visible through his advocacy for The Underline project to renovate public spaces in Miami, which is led by his daughter, another pillar of our community, new generation, Meg Daly.

Mr. Thomson represented the spirit of hard work and served as a mentor to coworkers and friends. Parker Thomson has left a legacy of service to his community, one that future generations should seek to emulate.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, this week, we celebrate National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. Law enforcement officers answer the call to public service. They enter into situations that put their lives on the line. When the natural human response to danger is to run away, these brave men and women run toward it, and they do this to protect their communities.

Our law enforcement officers occupy that thin blue line between good and evil. They stand between us and those who wish to do us harm and harm to our families.

To the 780,000 police officers across this country who put on the badge every day, thank you, and God bless.

CONGRATULATING HELEN HAWKINS

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to congratulate Helen Hawkins of Edwardsville, Illinois, for being inducted into the Senior Illinoisans Hall

of Fame. The recognition commemorates the achievements and contributions of citizens age 65 and older. Inductees are selected through a statewide nomination and judging process. The program distinguishes individuals in the areas of community service, education, the work force, and the arts.

Helen is a true public servant who has devoted many years to serving the residents of Madison County and Nameoki Township. Her no-nonsense style may have ruffled some feathers throughout the years, but she has never been afraid to fight for her constituents.

Helen, thank you for your public service.

HONORING BOB BUTLER

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to honor the longest serving mayor in the State of Illinois, Bob Butler, who is a very good friend of Marion. Now, he is a very good friend, but, whenever he first took office, he didn't know me well because I was only 2½ years old. He was first elected in April of 1963, and Bob is retiring this month after 55 years of service.

Bob has always been a straight shooter and a good public servant. His progrowth agenda has helped turn Marion into a regional powerhouse along I–57 in the State of Illinois. In fact, the industrial park in Marion is named after him, and Bob fondly refers to the city of Marion as the hub of the universe. He represents the dedication to public service that should serve as an inspiration to all of us.

Mayor Bob Butler, we honor you, and wish you a happy and well-deserved retirement.

RECOGNIZING SAM AND EVA JONES

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to recognize Sam and Eva Jones of Marion, Illinois. This remarkable couple was first married on September 27, 1936. Now, if you think about that, that was 80 years ago.

Sam worked for Central Illinois Power Service until he retired in 1978. Eva worked at Norge in Herrin and later as a cook for Washington Elementary School. Pillars of the community, they were longtime members of First Baptist Church in Marion and the Williamson County Farm Bureau. In 1993, their farm was honored as Family Farm of the Year by the Farm Bureau.

Sadly, Eva passed last month, at the age of 101. My prayers are with Sam and the entire Jones family. Thank you for making southern Illinois a wonderful place to live. God bless you.

PUERTO RICO'S SHADOW DELEGATION TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) for 5 minutes.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today, after almost 120 years under the American flag, Puerto Rico remains as a colony of the United States, or under the Territorial Clause, to use the constitutional term.

Our residents are subject to a second class citizenship. For all these years, the Federal Government has denied equal rights to all Puerto Ricans who have, in war and peace, made countless contributions to our Nation; who have bravely fought in every conflict since the Great War, defending our democratic values, yet they are being denied the right to vote for their Commander-in-Chief and have full representation in this Congress.

A large number of them have made the ultimate sacrifice, and when they do, their casket is flown back, covered in an American flag with 50 stars, and without the one representing them.

Puerto Rico has experienced longstanding inequities under Federal laws, which now the whole world has been able to witness firsthand following the devastation caused by Hurricane Maria.

□ 1030

Before that, hundreds of thousands of Puerto Ricans have already rejected this discrimination, choosing, instead, to buy their equality with a one-way airline ticket to Florida or simply changing their State ZIP Code.

Without the equal rights and responsibilities that are only available through statehood, Puerto Rico will never truly recover and prosper from the hurricane effects. That is the reason we demand and deserve statehood for Puerto Rico now. The islands overwhelmingly voted for statehood in 2012 by a margin of 61 percent, and in June of last year, 97 percent of the islands voted again for statehood.

That is the request that brought me here. That is what brings, today, the Governor of Puerto Rico, Ricardo Rosselló, Puerto Rico Senate President Thomas Rivera Schatz, House Speaker Johnny Mendez, and all other elected officials from the island who have come here to witness today's historic introduction of the Puerto Rico shadow delegation to this Congress. That delegation will demand that the United States recognize the will of the people of Puerto Rico to become a State.

This long-awaited action is in accord with the precedents set forth by the Tennessee Plan, adopted by the territories of Tennessee, Michigan, Oregon, California, Iowa, Kansas, and Alaska, which followed a similar path to eventual admission as States.

It is my honor to introduce this delegation of seven members—three Republicans, three Democrats, one Independent, divided into two Senators, five Members to the House—as we become a State.

Pedro Rosselló, former Governor of Puerto Rico, serves as the chair of the delegation; Carlos Romero Barceló to the senate, former Governor and a former Member of the house; Luis Fortuño, former Governor and a former Member of this House; Zoraida Fonalledas, Puerto Rico national committeewoman and businesswoman; Charlie Rodriguez, State chairman for the DNC and former senate president; Alfonso Aguilar, president of the Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles; and Ivan ''Pudge'' Rodriguez, a Major League Baseball player inducted into the Hall of Fame.

Puerto Rico has come to this House today to claim the American Dream and to fulfill its destiny, to obtain equality within the Nation, and to unleash our full potential. Statehood will make Puerto Rico stronger, but we, together, will make the United States a more perfect Union.

HONORING SERGEANT MAJOR ROBERT HAWKINS

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Major Robert Hawkins of the United States Army for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to our Nation. Sergeant Major Hawkins will soon transition from his current assignment as an Army Congressional Legislative Liaison Officer in the House of Representatives to serve in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology.

A native of Alexandria, Virginia, Sergeant Major Hawkins began his military career as an airborne infantryman in 1990. He subsequently served in assignments to the Republic of Panama; Fort Myers, Florida; Schofield Barracks, Hawaii; Fort Polk, Louisiana; Fort Bliss, Texas; Fort Campbell, Kentucky; and three times at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Sergeant Major Hawkins has served in multiple leadership and staff positions throughout his distinguished career. His combat deployments include one tour in Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and three tours of combat in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

In 2014, Sergeant Major Hawkins was selected as a fellow in the Army Congressional Fellowship Program. He subsequently served 12 months as a defense legislative fellow in my congressional office, representing the First Congressional District of Minnesota.

While working on our team, I came to know Sergeant Major Hawkins as a shining example of the Army values set forth in the Noncommissioned Officer's Creed. ''Competence'' is indeed Sergeant Major Hawkins' watchword, and his commitment to doing what good NCOs do, accomplishing every mission, while taking care of his teammates, was second to none.

For the next 2 years, Sergeant Major Hawkins served as a Congressional Legislative Liaison Officer in the United States Army House Liaison Division. As the primary link between House Members, their staff, and the committees, along with the Army, he has provided insight and understanding

of Army policies, actions, operations, and requirements. His firsthand knowledge of the military, its culture, and its tradition has been of tremendous value to congressional offices.

Sergeant Major Hawkins was especially effective in his service to Members and staff as he escorted them on fact-finding and oversight delegations within and outside the United States. Members and staff found him to be a thoughtful, intelligent, dedicated soldier in the very best traditions of America's Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to know and serve with Sergeant Major Hawkins during his time as Army Congressional Fellow and Congressional Legislative Liaison Officer in the House of Representatives.

On behalf of a grateful nation, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service and sacrifice of Sergeant Major Robert ''Bobby'' Hawkins and his family. I wish Sergeant Major Hawkins the very best as he begins a new chapter of dedicated service to our Nation in the United States Army.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN LARRY WINN, JR.

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the life of a long-time public servant in this body, one of my predecessors, former Third District Congressman from Kansas, Representative Larry Winn.

Larry passed away on New Year's Eve at the remarkable age of 98, and he will be dearly missed by his family and the people of the Third District. Larry will long be remembered in our community and in the Halls of Congress as a devoted public servant.

Representative Winn served in this body for 18 years, from 1967 to 1985. His time in the House spanned across nine Congresses and five Presidential administrations, from Lyndon B. Johnson to Ronald Reagan. He served alongside some of the great statesmen of his time.

Larry's freshman class in the House included later President George H.W. Bush. Larry and his wife, Joan, became good friends with the Bushes, and Joan and Barbara Bush were proud members of a club for congressional spouses called the 66 Club.

Larry became close friends with and greatly respected President Gerald Ford, who once visited the Third District and drew a huge crowd in my hometown of Overland Park.

Larry also represented our State, along with one of our most prominent Kansans ever, Senator Bob Dole.

Larry was known as a congenial Member who worked to find consensus and develop strong relationships with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. While he spent his entire time in Congress in the minority party, he made a priority of seeking out opportunities and friends on both sides of the aisle.

Representative Winn served on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for many years, ultimately becoming the ranking member on the committee. During his time working on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the United States grappled with major world events such as the Cold War, the Vietnam war, and conflict in the Middle East. In addition to his role on the Foreign Affairs Committee, he also represented the U.S. as a congressional representative to the United Nations, appointed by President Reagan. In all of these roles, he was an excellent representative of our country to the rest of the world.

Larry took tremendous pride in serving the people of the Third District. Constituent service was always one of his top priorities, and he believed that solving problems for his constituents was one of his most important responsibilities. If someone had an issue with a Federal agency, Larry and his staff would make sure that it got resolved. This principle of valuing and serving each individual constituent in the district is one that I try to follow to this day trying to fill his shoes.

He lived a great life outside of Congress as well. Larry was an alumnus of the University of Kansas school of journalism and a proud Jayhawk. I have even heard that he taught lifelong Wildcat current Senator PAT ROBERTS how to ''Wave the Wheat.''

When World War II began, he was unable to join the military due to the loss of one of his legs in an accident; however, he still served his country admirably by building airplanes in Kansas City. Other accomplishments of his included serving as the director of the National Association of Home Builders and the founding of the Kansas City, Kansas, Chamber's Congressional Forum, which I have the privilege of regularly addressing and is still going on today, starting its 50th year.

Larry was a mentor to me and so many aspiring elected officials in Kansas, dispensing valuable advice, and old war stories to help guide us along. He had a gift for humor and an ease with people that served him well in all of his endeavors. And most of all, he was a great man.

While we will mourn the loss of Larry, I take comfort knowing that he is now being reunited with Joan, his beloved wife of 73 years, who passed away in 2015. Larry also leaves behind a large and loving family. His legacy will live on through his four children—Larry Winn III, Douglas Winn, Janet Payne, and Cynthia Burr—plus 8 grandchildren and 16 great-grandchildren.

Larry's legacy will live on in other public servants whom he mentored and inspired. He left an indelible mark on this body, and because of his leadership here, Kansas and the United States is better off for it.

On behalf of the United States Congress, we are thankful for Larry Winn's service to our country. He is in God's hands now. May he rest in eternal peace.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes,

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the well of the Congress of the United States of America as a proud, liberated Democrat. A liberated Democrat, by my definition, is one who cannot only speak truth to power, but can also speak about power.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to honor and celebrate the life and legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King. And in so doing, I want to encourage persons to not only read the masterpiece that Dr. King wrote when he was in the Birmingham jail, but also read the letter that he was responding to.

This letter was written by eight persons, in my opinion, none of whom were bigots, none of whom taught or preached hate; eight persons who were of the religious community; eight persons who were beyond reproach, high moral standards, impeccable character.

You need to read the letter that Dr. King was responding to, the letter that was written by eight members of the clergy. And when you read this letter, as you go through it, you will get to the last paragraph.

I shall read the last paragraph and excerpt from it, if you will, not in its entirety, but I shall read an excerpt from the last paragraph, and then I want to contemporize the excerpt from the last paragraph.

Read it in its entirety. Read the letter from the Birmingham jail. But, my friends, please read the letter that he was responding to. If you do not read this letter, you cannot totally appreciate the message that Dr. King was conveying.

Here is what I shall read as an excerpt. It reads: ''When rights are consistently denied, a cause should be pressed in the courts and in negotiations among local leaders, and not in the streets.''

I just want to contemporize that sentence.

In the courts, let somebody else take care of this problem. There are other people who are prepared for this. They know best how to handle this. Let someone else do what we could take upon ourselves the duty to do. Let someone else be responsible for liberty and justice for all. Let someone else be responsible for government of the people, by the people, for the people. Let someone else do it.

Contemporizing this language, let the special prosecutor do it. The special prosecutor will give us a decision that we can appreciate, that we can take forth, that we can then claim has given us the foundation to do something significant.

Mr. Speaker, these were persons of honorable standing, great stature.

They meant well, but they wanted to let someone else do what they themselves could have had a hand in doing.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. King was a man who believed that bigotry and hatred must be confronted, and he understood this one basic premise: those who will tolerate bigotry and hatred, they will do very little to change it. They will find reasons why they can't change bigotry and hatred when given the opportunity.

There is always an excuse. It won't be the Good Samaritan response: If I don't help people who are being discriminated against, who are being kicked off of jobs because they are LGBTQ, who can't get loans because of their ethnicity, because of religiosity—invidious religiosity, I might add. They are being barred, banned.

□ 1045

They won't look to see what is happening to them. What they will do is ask: What will happen to me if I step out there and try to help them?

I don't think they are persons of ill will. I think that they are persons who mean well. But I ask people to understand the context of this time by understanding and reviewing the context of the time that Dr. King lived in and review that letter from the Birmingham jail—the masterpiece—but also read the letter that he was responding to.

Those who will tolerate bigotry will do little to change it.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, there is a major story on the front page of the Style Section about a young woman name Sarah Pool.

One of the headlines says: ''Sarah Pool, 31, has a baby and a job, and loves them both, but she fears she will be paying off student loans till the day she dies.''

She got loans totaling $60,000 but now owes $69,000. She is quoted as saying: ''I keep paying, but it is like pouring into a bucket with no bottom.''

Mr. Speaker, for several years, I have been speaking out about how harmful the Federal student loan program has become for many, many hundreds of thousands of students and families around this country.

In May of 2015, I wrote an article for the Washington Examiner newspaper with ideas about how to bring down the cost of college. In that article, I quoted hedge fund manager James Altucher, who wrote: ''We are graduating a generation of indentured students.''

An Ohio University economist, Richard Vedder, wrote a book several years ago entitled ''Going Broke By Degree.''

In the February issue of Chronicles magazine, which will be out in just a few days, I have another article; and in that article I say that student loan debt in the United States is now $1.48 trillion. That incredible sum is a heavy drag on the economy and a burden on young people, and Federal intervention in education is the cause.

It wasn't always this way.

In June of 1965, I began working as a salesman at the Sears store in Knoxville, receiving a 10-cents-an-hour raise over my job as a bag boy at the A&P. At Sears, my wage was $1.25 an hour. I was required to wear a suit and tie, and I was very proud of that job.

I worked full time that summer and usually around 20 hours a week after I began my freshman year at the University of Tennessee in late September.

After I had worked at Sears for 6 months—I didn't realize I had been there 6 months—I was called to the office for the first time. I was very concerned, to put it lightly. I met David Weaver, who was my same age, 18, at the escalator. I told him: I bet I was hit by one of those Hallmark shoppers—one of the mystery shoppers Sears had at the time. He told me he had just been called by a very angry woman to whom he had sold the wrong color of paint. David said that he was scared and that he had diabetes, and when he got too nervous, he would pass out. I can remember that conversation as if it happened yesterday.

Much to our relief, we had been called to the office so management could give us good news: because we had been working at Sears for 6 months, they were giving us a nickel-an-hour raise.

It shocks students at the University of Tennessee today when I tell them that tuition my freshman year was $90 per quarter, $270 for the academic year. By my senior year, it was $405. I remember hearing our minority leader, Mr. HOYER, say that when he started at the University of Maryland, it was $87 a semester. Almost no one left college in those days with debt unless they had bought a car or made some other major purchase. Students certainly did not go into debt for tuition because they could all work part time, as I did, and pay all their school expenses.

Now, over 44 million Americans carry student loan debt—some of those debts reaching into the six figures.

Readers Digest recently published an article in the December/January issue entitled ''The Student Debt Racket.'' The authors quote one student who owes $90,000 as saying: ''My loans are a black cloud hanging over me. I am a student debt slave.''

Colleges and universities began heavily promoting student loans in the late sixties and early seventies. They were able to tamp down opposition to tuition and fee increases by telling students: Don't worry, we will just get you a loan.

Then, because loans were available, many schools began raising tuition at two and three times the rate of inflation each year, and have continued to do so.

I remember reading an article about 3 years ago in The Post which said that student tuition had gone up 4½ times the rate of inflation since 1985. Now the cost of higher education has soared to such great heights that universities are bragging if they hold the annual increases to 2 or 3 percent. They never consider reductions, not even miniscule ones. Thus we have another example of how Big Government liberalism helps the few at the top while harming the many down below.

The Federal student loan program has made the owners of some loan servicing companies very wealthy and has been a boon to most college administrators and tenured professors; and all of this at great expense to students and their families.

When the Knoxville News Sentinel lists the highest paid people in east Tennessee each year, they are almost all at TVA or UT. Yet the pattern continues to repeat: Liberals find a very small group of people who are having trouble paying for something, then insist that the only solution is to let the Federal Government ''help.'' But whenever the Federal Government subsidizes something, the costs simply explode because most of the incentives or pressures to hold costs down vanish.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would say this is why Mark Cuban, the Shark Tank star, has said: If you want to make college really expensive, make it free.

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 51 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:

Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions and difficult times, with many forces and interests demanding their attention.

In these days, give wisdom to all Members, that they might execute their responsibilities to the benefit of all Americans.

Bless them, O God, and be with them and with us all this day and every day to come. May all that is done 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.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ESPAILLAT 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.

IN MEMORY OF ROCKY FAWCETT

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Lewis County Legislator Rocky Fawcett. Rocky was a dedicated public servant who never stopped believing in the potential of Lewis County. Rocky was involved in many local causes and organizations, such as the Cornell Cooperative Extension, the Lewis County Chamber of Commerce, and the Lewis County Development Corporation.

To all who knew him, Rocky was intelligent, driven, and deeply devoted to public service. Simply put: Rocky Fawcett set the gold standard for what it means to be a legislator.

Rocky was a dear friend and he always greeted me with a huge smile and a hug during my many constituent outreach events throughout Lewis County.

I invite Members to join me in keeping his wife, Mary, and his family in your thoughts and prayers. May we continue to honor his memory by being passionate advocates for our communities in Lewis County and beyond.

LET'S TAKE CARE OF AMERICA'S CHILDREN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater responsibility that we have than the health and well-being of America's children. The Children's Health Insurance Program has been a huge success. In just a few weeks, funding for this program will run out in my home State of Rhode Island.

This is a program that has provided health insurance to 9 million children from working families in this country, 27,000 children and pregnant women in my home State of Rhode Island. It has always been a bipartisan issue. This program has been a huge success. It brought the rate of uninsured children down from almost 14 percent when the program began to 4½ percent today.

And why haven't we reauthorized this program yet that ensures the health and well-being of America's children?

We just passed—or the Republicans just passed—a $1.5 trillion tax cut for the richest people in this country, the biggest corporations, unpaid for. But we can't manage to find money to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program?

I urge the Republican leadership in this Chamber to bring a clean reauthorization bill to the floor so we can reauthorize this effective and important program and take care of America's children.

WASHINGTON BUSINESSES GIVING BACK

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, we are already seeing the positive impact of tax reform. More than 100 businesses and corporations are giving back to their employees and their communities as a direct response to the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

This historic tax reform legislation has paved the way for a better American business environment, and hardworking people are benefiting from the contributions of major employers and service providers, including in my home State of Washington.

Boeing announced a total investment of $300 million dedicated to corporate giving, employee training, and infrastructure improvement. Alaska Airlines provided $1,000 bonuses for more than 20,000 employees. Washington Federal is increasing salaries by 5 percent for employees making under $100,000, investing in training, technology upgrades, and making a $5 million philanthropic contribution. Pacific Power has committed to passing the company's benefits on to their consumers, which include ratepayers in the Fourth Congressional District.

These benefits and tax relief will have a lasting effect on Washington families, and I look forward to continuing to work toward bigger paychecks, more jobs, and a prosperous economy.

COMPACT IMPACT RELIEF

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to reintroduce my Compact Impact Relief Act with my colleagues from Hawaii and the Northern Marianas as original cosponsors. Our bill would provide relief to Guam and other States and territories required by the Federal Government to provide local public services to more than 76,000 migrants under the Compacts of Free Association.

Guam remains the top destination for Compact migrants from the three freely associated States. Our island accommodates nearly 18,000 out of a population of just 175,000.

As the United States looks to renew the Compacts after 2023, Congress must increase mandatory Compact impact funding to affected jurisdictions like Guam. Congress should provide the funding level recommended by the Government Accountability Office, as I have called for repeatedly.

In the meantime, I hope this House will act on the practical policy changes included in my Compact Impact Relief Act.

HIGHLIGHTING THE COURAGE AND PERSEVERANCE OF SONIA WARSHAWSKI

(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 highlight the courage and perseverance of Sonia Warshawski, one of the few remaining Holocaust survivors in the Kansas City community and a constituent of mine. Now 91 years old, as a Polish teenager, she was forced into concentration camps, ripped from her family, and even had to watch as her mother walked into the gas chamber.

Her life is being highlighted in a recent documentary showing in American movie theaters called ''Big Sonia,'' co-directed by her granddaughter, Leah Warshawski. This beautiful film tells the story of her struggle and heartbreak and the power of love to overcome hate.

I have known Sonia for years as a friend, but also as a customer, as she runs the small tailoring business started by her husband, John, who is also a Holocaust survivor.

Sonia's story reminds us of the unspeakable evil that she and others in the Holocaust had to endure and that we must never forget today. But her story as a survivor also reminds us of humanity's beauty and kindness and the power to endure and overcome unspeakable tragedy.

Thank you for sharing your inspirational story with America, Big Sonia.

STAND WITH THE DREAMERS

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say to DREAMers, their parents, and TPS holders from El Salvador, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Honduras: I stand with you.

To date, over 15,000 young people have lost DACA due to congressional inaction, and the lives of over 800,000 young people are being used as a bargaining chip.

For what? A wall?

So stop playing with the people's lives. Enough is enough. Let's pass the Dream Act now.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 51, nays 331, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—51

Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Clarke (NY)
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Espaillat
Gallego
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Khanna
Lee
McGovern
Meng
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Norcross
Pallone
Pelosi
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Slaughter
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Velázquez
Waters, Maxine

NAYS—331

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Levin
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—49

Adams
Bass
Butterfield
Cleaver
Comer
Conaway
Culberson
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
Doggett
Fudge
Gabbard
Gosar
Granger
Hanabusa
Harris
Higgins (NY)
Hollingsworth
Jenkins (WV)
Kelly (IL)
Kind
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Lucas
Lynch
Mast
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Messer
Payne
Pocan
Posey
Renacci
Rooney, Thomas J.
Russell
Scalise
Tsongas
Turner
Wagner
Walker
Walz
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Young (AK)

□ 1239

Messrs. BIGGS, GROTHMAN, EVANS, CARBAJAL, KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mses. BLUNT ROCHESTER, PINGREE, and Mr. HECK changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CROWLEY, AL GREEN of Texas, CORREA, NADLER, and SERRANO changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to make votes due to an off Hill meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall No. 5.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "No" on Mr. ESPAILLAT's Motion to Adjourn. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall No. 5.

ABOLISH HUMAN TRAFFICKING DAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Keisha was 16 years old when she ran away from a foster family to avoid being sexually assaulted by that family. She thought she was finally safe from abuse when she met a man named Mastur D.

Mastur D promised her that he would return her to her biological family. But he lied. He forced her to have sex with other men for money. Now she found herself to be a trafficked victim of the sex slave trade.

Mr. Speaker, she was arrested for prostitution. After her second arrest, authorities finally rescued her from the trafficking scourge and provided her a way out of that situation.

My legislation, the Abolish Human Trafficking Act, will increase prosecutions for perpetrators of human trafficking, like Mastur D, and hold those accountable for their crimes of sex slavery.

We must support victims of human trafficking and put their predators where they belong: behind bars. Tomorrow is Abolish Human Trafficking Day, our society must prosecute the traffickers and rescue victims of this scourge on America.

And that is just the way it is.

ANNIVERSARY OF APPROVING WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today, this House passed a constitutional amendment granting women the right to vote. 274 Members voted for it, but 136 voted against it. One Representative said: ''Important issues cannot be decided by women's fears and tears and emotions. They have to be decided by the real, manly men of America.''

One hundred years later, unfortunately, we hear similar comments. To get our rights and to protect our rights, the battle continues. But 2018, Mr. Speaker, is the year of the women. We will never give up our rights, we will never give up our votes, and we will never, ever give up our voice.

Mr. Speaker, we have history slapping us in the face. We, as a body, need to recognize and respect women's rights in this House and in America.

MORE MONEY, LESS PROBLEMS

(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, yesterday, I was grateful to learn that Tidewater Boats is investing $8.3 million to expand their manufacturing facility in Lexington, South Carolina, creating 100 new jobs.

This news is on top of Aflac announcing they will be expanding their 700 employees in Columbia, South Carolina, and doubling their employee 401(k) matching funds.

On the same day Republicans passed historic tax cuts, AT&T, led by Pam Lackey, announced they are providing 200,000 employees a $1,000 bonus. Comcast will be providing $1,000 bonuses to 100,000 employees. BB&T, a valued corporate citizen led by Mike Brennan, will be raising their employee wages to $15 an hour and providing a $1,200 bonus for 27,000 employees.

Boeing of Charleston announced they will be donating $100 million to charities that focus on education, local communities, veterans, and military personnel.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is not only for businesses. I appreciate that next month American families will see more of their own money in their paycheck.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Best wishes to DARRELL ISSA and Kathy Issa for their dedicated service as they announce retirement. We look forward to their continued service for the American people.

□ 1245

FIX OUR TAX CODE

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the tax scam that was voted for by 100 percent of Republicans and signed by President Trump.

We all know that this bill puts middle class families out in the cold. This tax scam raised taxes on 86 million American families. It robs our ability to help American veterans, children, and seniors. Republicans have slashed taxes on the wealthiest among us, and now they want us to slash, cut, decimate Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Some of my colleagues would have us believe that this bill is about prosperity for all.

Prosperity for whom?

It is a tax giveaway to billionaires and millionaires.

Does slashing tax revenue create prosperity for communities like Flint, Michigan, where American families continue to suffer through a water crisis, a crisis that my Republican colleagues claim they can't find the funding to help our American brothers and sisters who are suffering?

Republicans want us to believe this bill is fiscally responsible, but we all know there is nothing fiscally responsible about taking healthcare away from millions of Americans while ballooning our country's deficit by as much as $2 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, we need to fix our Tax Code, not leave American families out in the cold.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT THOMAS REID, JR.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank Sergeant Thomas Reid, Jr., for his 45 years of service with the Cincinnati Police Department.

A lot has changed since he joined the department back in 1972, after serving in Vietnam, but one thing has remained the same. For 4½ decades, Sergeant Reid continued to dedicate himself to keeping our community safe.

During his time on the force, Sergeant Reid led by example and passed his knowledge and experience on to his fellow officers, often advising them to ''treat others as you want to be treated.''

Sergeant Reid retired at the end of December as the Cincinnati Police Department's longest-serving member, and his leadership and guidance will be missed. The city of Cincinnati is a better place because of his service, and his legacy and impact will be felt in our community for years to come. For that, Mr. Speaker, we Cincinnatians are deeply grateful and indebted to him.

Thank you, Sergeant Reid.

BRING DREAM ACT TO HOUSE FLOOR

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, college students everywhere are enjoying the last days of vacation before heading back to school. But for thousands of people, this break was spent trying to figure out how to stay in the only home they have ever known.

There have been multiple stories of young DREAMers being detained over this holiday break. These are stellar students who attend elite schools, like UC San Diego and UC Berkeley. They are now sitting in detention facilities, unable to go back to school and continue their education.

Is this the America that our forefathers fought for, one where bright students sit in detention facilities instead of classrooms, questioning if they can ever make the contribution to our United States of America that they dream of?

Mr. Speaker, I once again plead with you, with all due respect, to please bring the Dream Act to the floor. The American people overwhelmingly support it.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THOMAS S. MONSON

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a beloved worldwide leader, Thomas S. Monson, who served as the president and prophet of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints until his passing last week.

From an early age, President Monson led a faithful life serving those most in need and seeking out those who often went unnoticed. His loving service spanned over half a century.

On a personal note, while I was mayor of Provo, our historic tabernacle burned down in a tragic fire. The devastating loss of such a treasured building in our community was palpable.

But President Monson had the unmistakable foresight to know that something even more remarkable could one day stand in its place. I will never forget the audible gasp from thousands of church members when President Monson announced that, from the ashes of the tabernacle, a new temple would be built in its stead.

Today, that temple stands as an extraordinary reminder of his unmatched leadership that led us from loss and sorrow to hope and joy.

My wife, Sue, and I express our deepest condolences to President Monson's family and the many members of the

church around the world that grieve at the loss of this important leader.

SUPPORTING PROTECTED STATUS

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, President Trump took action to undocument 200,000 immigrants from El Salvador, who have TPS and have been working regularly and renewing their documents in the U.S. for more than 20 years. He said the same thing to 58,000 Haitians. They need to leave in another 16 months. This is the same thing that happened with the DREAMers. He made them undocumented, 800,000 of whom are working.

Mr. Speaker, I am tired of coming to work here and meeting people in the cafeteria and people who are sweeping floors and doing all kinds of work here in the Capitol who now are in fear of losing their legal protected status and being able to work here in this country because they are undocumented. They want to make people who are working, yes, right here in the Capitol of the United States undocumented.

For that, I call upon us to do the work that we were sent here to do and to protect people. We shouldn't be sending 58,000 Haitians back to the poorest country in this hemisphere from the richest country. That is unfathomable and unconscionable and we shouldn't do it.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 54, nays 311, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—54

Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Espaillat
Gallego
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Jayapal
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Khanna
Kihuen
Lawrence
Lee
Lowey
Maloney, Carolyn B.
McGovern
Meng
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Norcross
Pallone
Pelosi
Pocan
Rice (NY)
Rosen
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Slaughter
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

NAYS—311

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Levin
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—66

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brown (MD)
Butterfield
Calvert
Carson (IN)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
Demings
Denham
Dent
Doggett
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Granger
Hanabusa
Higgins (NY)
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Jordan
Kelly (IL)
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Mast
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Messer
Pascrell
Payne
Quigley
Renacci
Richmond
Rooney, Thomas J.
Rush
Russell
Scalise
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Shuster
Sinema
Stefanik
Stewart
Taylor
Trott
Turner
Walden
Walz
Wilson (FL)

□ 1316

Messrs. POLIQUIN, HUFFMAN, WENSTRUP, and Mrs. NOEM changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. KIHUEN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

IF YOU DON'T WANT A TAX CUT, YOU CAN MAIL IT BACK TO THE IRS

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, some folks in Washington are upset because we just passed the largest tax cut in American history. They think that this money is Washington's money and that politicians and bureaucrats should decide how to spend it.

I couldn't disagree more. You and I know that this money belongs to the American people. It came out of their wallets.

Under our new law, we put hardworking families first by helping them cope with the costs of raising children by doubling the child tax credit.

We also help small businesses by cutting their taxes so that they can compete with foreign companies and create jobs right here in America.

For those folks who don't think that they need an average extra $1,500 or more a year to spend, or who think that politicians and bureaucrats can spend their money better, I have a good solution: go ahead and drop your new refund check in the mail. Send it to the Internal Revenue Service. The IRS will be glad to take your money.

TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Trump administration's decision to end temporary protected status, TPS, for more than 200,000 Salvadorans.

TPS holders are thoroughly vetted legal residents who have contributed to our economy and to our communities for almost two decades. Most TPS recipients now call the United States home. Many are parents to children who are American citizens, and tearing these families apart is a heartless and cruel act.

In their decision, this administration claims they reviewed the disaster-related conditions on which the original determination was made; however, they failed to consider the current realities that make El Salvador one of the most dangerous countries in the world. This irresponsible decision will drop hundreds of thousands of people into violence and disaster.

Sending 200,000 Salvadorans, many from my district, to a dangerous foreign country is inhumane. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to immediately pass the American Promise Act so that we can correct this despicable action.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO PHILLIP LYONS

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a member of the Greatest Generation, a Montanan whose service to our Nation and Montana stretched across eight decades.

Born and raised in Butte, Phillip ''Herk'' Lyons answered the call to serve following the attack on Pearl Harbor. He joined the Navy and served as a submariner in both World War II and the Korean war.

Phil became active with military service organizations in the 1950s, serving in leadership roles in the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans, among others.

Phil was known as ''Mr. DAV.'' He logged more than 50,000 miles, 16,000 hours, and carried more than 1,700 fellow veterans to appointments.

On behalf of all Montanans, I honor the memory of Phil, and I extend my condolences to his daughter, Debbie, his family, his friends, and all those whom his service touched.

ACT NOW ON A PERMANENT SOLUTION TO PROTECT DREAMERS

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, given that each day that Congress delays action on the Dream Act, 122 people lose their DACA protected status—since September 5, when Trump eliminated DACA, close to 16,000 young people have lost their protected status and face daily risk of deportation; given the fact that we have pleaded with Republican leadership on the urgency of finding a permanent legislative solution that will protect DREAMers; given the fact that the contradictions and confusion in the negotiations going on to craft a legislative fix continue to abound; and given the fact that this House has the opportunity to vote on a clean Dream Act, we must act now on a permanent solution that will protect DREAMers.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 62, nays 324, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—62

Bass
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
DeFazio
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Espaillat
Fudge
Gallego
Gomez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Khanna
Kihuen
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Maloney, Carolyn B.
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Norcross
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Pocan
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Sarbanes
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Slaughter
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch

NAYS—324

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Levin
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—45

Adams
Barletta
Blum
Burgess
Butterfield
Cook
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Doggett
Gabbard
Gaetz
Garamendi
Granger
Hanabusa
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Jenkins (WV)
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Mast
McHenry
McNerney
Messer
Posey
Quigley
Renacci
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Russell
Sánchez
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott, David
Shuster
Turner
Wagner
Wilson (FL)
Young (AK)

□ 1346

Messrs. MITCHELL and HARPER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 10, 2018, I missed rollcall votes 5–7 on the motions to adjourn from Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. GRIJALVA. I was attending meetings off-campus and was not able to return for these unexpected votes that were not on the House schedule. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted: ''Nay'' on rollcall vote 5 on the motion to adjourn from Mr. ESPAILLAT, ''Nay'' on rollcall vote 6 on the motion to adjourn from Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and ''Nay'' on rollcall vote 7 on the motion to adjourn from Mr. GRIJALVA.

INCLUDE E-VERIFY IN IMMIGRATION REFORM PACKAGE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congress should include an E-Verify employment eligibility verification program in any immigration reform package. E-Verify is the most effective deterrent to illegal immigration because it shuts off the jobs magnet and saves jobs for hardworking Americans. It is no surprise that E-Verify receives the most public support—82 percent—of any proposed immigration reform.

The E-Verify legislation, the Legal Workforce Act, approved by the Judiciary Committee, has the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and immigration enforcement groups. It provides employers with an efficient and workable system to verify their employees' work status, and the requirement for employers to verify their workers only applies to new employees, not existing workers.

Members should hesitate to support any immigration reform package that does not include requiring employers to use E-Verify. Congress should put the interests of American workers first.

LET STATES REGULATE MARIJUANA

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I was gravely concerned last week when Attorney General Sessions removed the guidance of the Cole memo regarding the way that the Department of Justice treats marijuana in jurisdictions where it is legal for medicinal or commercial circumstances. I happen to represent one of those States, the State of Colorado, which has a regulatory system for marijuana that has now been called into jeopardy through a Federal overreach.

Effectively, Attorney General Sessions has left the entire fate of not just the industry and those who work in it but also consumers in my State in the hands of 93 U.S. attorneys, including the one for our State who, if they wake up on the wrong side of the bed one morning, could engage in a mass enforcement action against residents of Colorado who are following our State law.

I call on President Trump to overturn his attorney, and I call upon this body to put the appropriate funding restrictions, based on the McClintock-Polis amendment, into the final funding bill in the next few weeks to prevent the Department of Justice from using funds given to them by Congress to contravene State law in jurisdictions that have chosen to regulate marijuana.

RECOGNIZING THE BICENTENNIAL OF SPENCER COUNTY, INDIANA

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of an important milestone in Indiana history, the bicentennial of Spencer County, Indiana.

Founded in 1818 by Captain Spier Spencer, this rural county along the Ohio River was the boyhood home of Abraham Lincoln. Years later, when recalling his time in Spencer County, the man who became our 16th President stated quite succinctly: ''There, I grew up.''

In addition to the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial and a scenic state park, Spencer County is home to St. Meinrad Archabbey and Indiana's premier tourist destinations, Holiday World and Splashin' Safari. Wildly recognized as the world's first theme park, Holiday World draws hundreds of thousands of visitors to the county each year.

Today, strategically connected to the world by Interstate 64, US 231, rail, and the Ohio River, Spencer County has become a leader in agriculture, manufacturing, maritime and ground logistics, steel production, power generation, and world class family entertainment.

I proudly salute the citizens and the wonderful hometowns of Spencer County on this notable occasion.

CONGRATULATING CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY LANDSCAPING STUDENTS

(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 congratulate the landscaping students at the Central Pennsylvania Institute of Science and Technology for their fourth consecutive first-place win at the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

CPI students again took home the top prize this year in the agricultural education landscape exhibits. In total, eight schools entered this competition at the Farm Show, which is the Nation's largest indoor agricultural event.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the following students who are a part of the winning team: Charlee Marshall, Alexis Witherite, Landon Wagner, Jarod Williams, Robert Ficarro, and Calen McCool.

The students have learned from CPI's horticulture and landscaping instructor Joe Luther. Just a couple of weeks ago, Mr. Luther was named the National Career and Technical Education Teacher of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am most proud of these CPI students and Mr. Luther for being four-time first-place champions at the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

I congratulate them, and I know that they will continue this fine tradition of being the team to beat at the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 140, AMENDING THE WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 681 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 681

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 140) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-54 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of a very important measure. The resolution provides for consideration of S. 140, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the White Mountain Apache Tribe Settlement Fund. This bill also includes the text of S. 249, a bill to provide that the pueblo of Santa Clara may lease for 99 years certain restricted land; and H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2017.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, 30 minutes of which will be equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, and 30 minutes of which will be equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the first two items are noncontroversial; however, I am very pleased that within S. 140, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act is included. This language would allow Tribal governments to be excluded from requirements for employers under the National Labor Relations Act. When President Franklin Roosevelt signed the NLRA into law in 1935, Congress wisely excluded governments, all governments, from the definition of ''employer.''

At the bill signing of the NLRA, President Roosevelt said: ''This Act defines, as a part of our substantive law, the right of self-organization of employees in industry for the purpose of collective bargaining, and provides methods by which the Government can safeguard that legal right.''

The President made clear in his speech at that time that the intent of the law is that it should apply only to workers in the private sector. Tribes are governments and should be treated as such. The intent of the law was and is clear: Tribal governments supervise the employees within their governments and enterprises, not the Federal Government.

From 1935 until 2003, nearly seven decades, the National Labor Relations Board agreed and interpreted the statute in a way that did not apply to Indian Tribes because they were governments. In 2004, the NLRB abruptly changed course and, for the first time, held the act applicable to Indian Tribes. The NLRB did this by highlighting the fact that the act did not expressly include Tribal governments among those excluded from the phrase ''employer.'' This is simply an egregious act of bureaucratic overreach.

Let me be clear. In this case, acting on its own, the NLRB expanded its jurisdiction. Neither the existing administration at the time nor Congress asked or ordered the NLRB to take this action.

The impacts of labor strife on Tribal governments and economies are more harmful than on other governments because there is no effective tax base in Tribal communities. Indian lands are held in trust by the United States and are not subject to taxation. The high unemployment rates and legal restrictions make income taxation an unfeasible option.

As a result, the businesses operated by Tribal governments, gaming operations, Tribal agriculture, energy and timber operations, and other Tribal government enterprise constitute the sole source of revenue that is used to fund essential government services for Tribes.

This bill has drawn bipartisan support in our effort to reverse the decision of the NLRB. In the 114th Congress, the same language passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 249–177.

□ 1400

This bill will strengthen Tribal sovereignty and correct this overreach, directing the NLRB to enforce the NLRA, National Labor Relations Act, as it was originally intended. In the end, Mr. Speaker, all we are doing here today with this bill is affirming what was Congress' original intent. The NLRA does not have jurisdiction over Tribal governments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, over 3 months ago, the funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, expired. Today, families throughout the country, including 90,000 children in my home State of Colorado, face great uncertainty about the future of their healthcare.

When CHIP was first passed, over 20 years ago, it was done in a bipartisan manner, and, until recently, CHIP has always been a bipartisan, nondivisive issue. It is unfortunate to see that, today, here, we are in this body under Republican leadership and, somehow, even children's health insurance has become a political football while we while away our time, our precious legislative time, on bills that have passed this body before and don't go anywhere.

In our most recent Band-Aid for government funding, House Republicans made a claim that CHIP was extended until March 31, but that wasn't the case. By some reports, States could run out of funding in the next few weeks. In fact, in Colorado, our own budget experts predict the State will run out of children's health insurance money by the end of February. Cancellation letters are literally scheduled to go out at the end of this month.

Mr. Speaker, this simply isn't a way to govern, crisis to crisis, ignoring the real issues people care about in order to consider special interest legislation. Republican leadership and the Trump administration continue to refuse to work on finding a bipartisan solution for the hundreds of thousands who have Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival—or DACA recipients—who are in limbo. We can simply put that bill on the floor today, the Dream Act, and I feel it would pass.

We have the votes to do so, Mr. Speaker. Let's simply have a vote. It is a purely manufactured crisis.

I am happy to say we will be giving the opportunity for Members of this body to defeat the previous question and move to a vote on the Dream Act, shortly. My colleague, Mr. CORREA, has joined us to offer that motion in a few minutes.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle often say that the real deadline for a DACA solution isn't until March, but, in reality, every day, already over 100 Deferred Action recipients lose their protected status, are unable to work with their situation unresolved.

For those DACA recipients, the deadline isn't March. The deadline has already passed, hence, the urgency. Now is the time to pass the Dream Act, to allow these DACA recipients to continue to live and work and serve in the only Nation that many of them have ever known their whole lives.

All the while, congressional Republicans still refuse to work with Democrats on a long-term government funding solution. Here we are less than 10 days from another government shutdown. The Federal Government continues to move from quick spending patch to quick spending patch, costing taxpayers more in the long run by preventing our agencies from doing the planning necessary to improve efficiency.

Today we are only 5 legislative days away—9 actual days—from a government shutdown and the huge negative repercussions that would follow. As a former businessowner, I know, firsthand, the value of long-term budgeting and stability. Millions of Americans know how to plan their family budget and their home budget. Why can't Congress do it for the country?

Instead of working on a long-term budget solution, the House is spending its time on other legislation. Here we have a bill that undermines workers' rights and their protections under the National Labor Relations Act.

In addition to this controversial bill, there are two attached pieces of legislation that were originally separate

bills that easily could have gone on the suspension calendar and would have largely been noncontroversial. They passed on unanimous consent in the Senate and in the House Natural Resources Committee, but their fate is put in jeopardy by putting them onto a controversial bill.

The first bill amends the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010. To clarify, that is a separate economic development fund known as the WMAT settlement fund that can be accessed to cover potential cost overruns for this rural water project.

The Interior Department has said it is unsure if the settlement fund could be used for additional costs, and so this clarifies that water-related economic development projects would specifically include the planning, design, and construction of the rural water system. This legislation could have passed and, likely, could have become law but, instead, has been put into jeopardy by affixing it to a bill that is unlikely to go anywhere.

The second uncontroversial bill that is wrapped up is regarding the authority of pueblos. It concerns two New Mexican pueblos and simply clarifies that they could lease their lands that are held in trust by the Federal Government for 99 years. This legislation ensures Native Americans have the right to their lands that they deserve. It respects their sovereignty and nations in a noncontroversial way.

I am fully supportive of these two technical and simple pieces of legislation, but, unfortunately, because they are attached to a bill that isn't going anywhere, are very unlikely to become law.

These are the types of bills that could go straight to the suspension calendar and straight through the Senate and should be signed by the President, but, instead, they are being put in jeopardy by lumping them in with a bill that is unlikely to become law.

There are so many of these types of Natural Resources Committee bills from both Democrats and Republicans that should be making their way forward as stand-alone items.

I am glad, for instance, that one that I authored, my Bolt's Ditch and the WEDGE Act—actually, two that I authored—were put forward and passed by this House and not attached to other controversial legislation.

I am also reintroducing, soon, a bicameral bill that I also consider noncontroversial, the Continental Divide Wilderness, Recreation and Camp Hale Legacy Act bill. It would preserve over 90,000 acres of wilderness and recreation lands in Summit and eastern Eagle Counties, and is endorsed by local businesses, commissioners, and towns across the area.

It was crafted with input from dozens of stakeholder groups, including the Wilderness Society, Vail Resorts, the Outdoor Industry Association, the International Mountain Bicycling Association, Conservation Colorado, and many municipalities and local businesses. It will help sustain our recreational economy in Eagle and Summit Counties, protect watersheds, and preserve important wildlife corridors and tourism opportunities.

These are the kinds of bills that we should be moving forward from the Natural Resources Committee, not controversial bills that actually take away the rights of American citizens, including Native American citizens.

And, while we are not today, we should never be moving forward on Natural Resources Committee bills that actually whittle away at the public lands we all own and the Antiquities Act by shrinking monuments like Bears Ears or making it easier to destroy lands we cherish and value.

All I ask is that we separate out these two Natural Resources bills, send them to the suspension calendar, and not let them be put in jeopardy by affixing them to the fundamental underlying legislation which is controversial, namely, the Tribal labor bill. That is the bill that is the main controversial bill in this package.

And, of course, I stand here as a supporter of the rights of every American to organize. I am a supporter of workers' rights, and I am also a strong supporter of Tribal sovereignty, not only principles under American law, but the right thing to do.

I, like many of my colleagues, place a great deal of importance in Tribal self-determination, autonomy, local control, and independent governance for our nations. In fact, I have been the champion of sovereignty, and I have long voted in favor of legislation that allows Tribal discretion in the judicial processes and in education.

But, of course, the right to organize is an inalienable right of every American, protecting our workers, including Native American workers, to fight for a safe working environment regardless of what entity owns the company they work for. Legislation balancing these two competing principles is possible.

Reconciling these two priorities can be difficult, but I think that there is a way to do it. Instead, this bill drives a wedge between issues or groups that have a history of working strongly together, such as Native Americans and labor unions.

We can balance critical rights to sovereignty with the protections that are due to every American citizen regardless of their race, ethnicity, cultural practices, membership in an Indian nation, or governing structures. This legislation does not find the right balance. It hurts workers of all stripes and colors, including many Native American workers.

Workers have the right to collectively bargain; otherwise, workplaces become unsafe, sexual harassment can go unchecked, and the income gap continues to widen. This legislation would strip Native Americans and non-Native Americans, many of whom work for Native American enterprises, of the right to collectively bargain.

Without the right to self-governance, we would not have the strong communities present across the country today. Without the right to collective bargaining, we would not have the strong and growing economy that supports our middle class. This legislation simply does not succeed in balancing both of these values.

I also want to point out that President Trump agrees with me, or at least he did last time he commented on this 25 years ago. In 1993, at a hearing before the House Committee on Natural Resources regarding the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, then private citizen Trump testified regarding the legal barriers facing labor unions at that time to organize workers employed at Tribal casinos. His testimony said, in part: ''At present, even union workers in States like New Jersey would have no federally or State protected rights or the ability to organize in casinos on Tribal lands. The unions hope to do something about this. They hope to gain the right to recognition, the right to organize if they so choose. Quite frankly, I hope they have better luck than we have had so far.''

Mr. Speaker, the last time the President commented on this, it is clear that he also believed that workers on Tribal land should have the right to collectively bargain. I hope that his administration would not be supportive of this legislation if it were to move through Congress, which it is unlikely to do.

Instead of policies that benefit those at the top, I have a number of ideas that I will be talking about later that we can move forward to empower workers and help make sure that the 21st century economy works for everyone.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Colorado covered a lot of ground, so let me try to respond to some of that area because a lot of it doesn't have a whole lot to do with the legislation until the final phase of his remarks.

In terms of CHIP, we actually agree. I think that's something—and, frankly, this House should be proud it passed a CHIP bill on a bipartisan basis months ago. Our real problem is the United States Senate simply hasn't produced legislation. It doesn't have to accept our legislation. It just needs to pass a CHIP bill so we can go to conference and bargain.

I am pleased that both sides, frankly, have worked to make sure that, when we have done extensions of government spending as we work through some of these knotty issues, we continue to fund CHIP. I think the leadership on both sides of the aisle have been clear about that, and I think we will. But, again, it will be great when the Senate finally passes a bill or we make this part of a larger spending bill.

In terms of my friend's points about the Dream Act, I am honestly heartened at the discussion that took place at the White House yesterday. I think there is a genuine desire to come to an agreement on DACA. But the real issue there is border security in addition to legal status.

These folks, obviously, I think, deserve legal status; but you also have to fix the problem, and the problem is on the border. So the outline of the deal is there if people approach it in good faith on both sides of the aisle. I take the fact that we had leadership in both parties meeting with the President yesterday as a good sign in that regard.

In terms of the budget, we probably have at least some areas of agreement. My friend didn't vote for it, but it is worth noting, the House passed every single appropriations bill before the September 30 deadline. We have been waiting now for over 120 days for the United States Senate to just pass a single appropriations bill.

We are in discussions with them now, and I think at some point, when there is an agreement as to what the top line number is—and I think we might not be too far away from that—then we will be able to proceed. But again, this House has done its work. Just as it did on CHIP, it produced legislation on time, and it is prepared to sit down and negotiate with the Senate whenever the Senate decides it can get around to getting its job done.

In terms of the National Labor Relations Act, the Tribal sovereignty portion of this bill, let me point out a couple of things.

My friend does have an excellent record, honestly, in terms of support on Native American issues. This is just an issue where we disagree. There will be Republicans and Democrats who oppose this legislation. There will be Republicans and Democrats who support this legislation.

It is not really purely a partisan question at all, but it is worth noting, the Indian community is united on this issue. The National Congress of American Indians, over 150 Tribal organizations and individual Tribes have come and asked the Congress to correct this oversight.

The fact that this happened in the way it did, that is, the National Labor Relations Board acted on its own to extend its jurisdiction, had no instructions from Congress to do that, had no request from the administration to do that, they just decided they would do it all, that is my definition of a regulatory body run amuck.

For almost 70 years, the NLRB recognized that it did not have jurisdiction in this area and did not try and do it. This is a very new thing. It aroused opposition in Indian Country immediately.

Again, we don't apply these standards to any State government or any local government. We have lots of State governments and lots of local governments involved in activities that are not strictly governmental. They run municipal golf courses. They do water parks. None of these things are necessarily inherently government. They are not forced to comply with this. So we should extend to Tribal government, which we historically have done, the exact same status and rights in this regard as we do to State and local governments.

We would all be pretty upset if the Federal Government decided it would interject itself in this way into the affairs of any individual State or any of the individual localities that we represent.

□ 1415

Working for a public entity is different. You certainly have rights, but there are restrictions. You have certain rights, like the right to strike, that in most States and most localities do not exist. Tribes should have the same right to make those sorts of decisions for themselves. Again, they resent and have resented historically the violation of their sovereignty. In this case, a regulatory agency without the authority of this body and without the authority of the administration that existed at that time acted on its own.

What the Indian nations and Indian Country have come and asked is: Restore us the sovereignty that you historically accorded us.

That is all this legislation does.

The last point, my friend says this is unlikely to become law. I beg to disagree. Not only did this pass the House on a bipartisan vote in the last Congress, but this Congress it has been reported out of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs on a bipartisan vote. There is every reason to believe this. We will see what the administration does. But I suspect views change over 25 years, and I would hope the administration is supportive of this. As a matter of fact, as I recall, I think they issued a statement to that effect.

So, regardless, let's do our job. Let's continue to do the job we did in the last Congress when, on a bipartisan basis, Republicans and Democrats alike decided Tribal sovereignty was an important issue. We should work together to defend it and to expand it. In this case, we are working to reclaim something that a Federal agency took away, acting on its own, over a decade ago. So the solution to this is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge my friends to support the rule and, more importantly, the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, when we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule—not just any amendment, but an amendment to bring up the bipartisan, bicameral bill, H.R. 3440, the Dream Act.

It is far past time that we consider this urgent piece of legislation, the lack of which is tearing apart the lives of over 100 aspiring Americans every day who are unable to do what you and I take for granted, Mr. Speaker, which is simply go to work the next day. Every day that we fail to act, approximately 122 DREAMers lose their legal ability to work.

Mr. Speaker, even Republicans have called for a vote on this critical issue. At the end of last year, 34 Republican colleagues sent a letter to Speaker RYAN urging a vote before the year's end, a vote that never happened, a vote my colleague, Mr. CORREA, is giving us a chance to take now.

How much longer will this body be complicit in the Trump administration's assault on DREAMers?

It is time we listen to the vast majority of Americans and the majority of this body and act to protect courageous, aspiring Americans like the group from Colorado I met with yesterday.

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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, recently, my daughter came home from high school accompanied by two of her good friends. These young ladies are about 16 years of age. They wanted to sit down and talk to me a little bit, so we sat down and we spoke. After a while, I learned these young ladies were very nervous and very scared. They were DREAMers.

They had a basic question for me, which was: What can we do? What can you do for us?

Very, very tough questions. After a moment I answered them: Continue to study hard. Continue to follow the law. Be good students and don't give up hope.

At the same time I told them: Don't worry about Washington, D.C. I am going to Washington to fight for you.

That is what we are doing here today, myself and my colleagues, fighting for DREAMers, fighting to make sure that they have a shot at the American Dream.

Now, I am happy to say today that DREAMers enjoy support of not only Democrats, but Republicans as well on this floor.

Why?

Because all of us know who DREAMers are. DREAMers are hardworking individuals. They serve in our military. They are soldiers, police officers, firefighters, nurses, teachers, and, of course, they are also our neighbors. DREAMers also are very good immigrants. They pay their taxes and follow the law.

Do you know what?

They provide value to our country.

Recently, I also had the opportunity to visit my son's high school, the Air Force Naval ROTC program. I went to be part of what is called a pass in review. Some very nice, honorable young cadets passing in review, all saluting the flag of the United States, all taking the Pledge of Allegiance to our country and to our flag.

Do you know something?

A lot of those cadets were DREAMers.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the chance to do what is right. We have a chance to do our job. Let the Dreamer legislation come before us for a vote and let's give the DREAMers the opportunity to earn the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, let's not live with regrets. Let's not look back 5, 10, 15 years from now and say what we could have, should have, would have. Now is the time to act. Now is the time to vote for our DREAMers.

I ask my colleagues to please vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring up the Dream Act to vote for justice and equity.

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

Again, Mr. Speaker, I certainly respect my friend's right to bring up a subject that they think is important and is important, and it is appropriate that they use their time to do that.

I would remind them that there is a negotiation underway. I think the issue here is less about DACA probably and more about border security. The issues are naturally paired together. These young people came here through no fault of their own. They are not responsible for any sort of criminal act. But they were transported across a very porous border.

So to ensure that we are not here again doing the same thing again, strengthening that border at the same time that we provide legal status seems the appropriate thing to do. I suspect neither is achievable without the other linked together.

So I take it that the two sides are negotiating. I am not involved in those negotiations. I am not a member of the relevant committees, but I think the two sides are involved in that negotiation. My hope is that they come to an agreement and that we can have a large, bipartisan victory and a piece of legislation that we are all proud of. But I suspect it is going to take some give-and-take on each side to achieve that.

I do want to go back, though, to the principal underlying legislation here and ask my friends—many of whom, by the way, will support this legislation. There will be considerable Democratic support for this. But I would hope—and, again, I understand this is an issue of competing goods, but sovereignty is not something we should grant to States and localities and deny Indian Tribes.

We should not have a double standard here. If we need to make changes across the entire Labor Relations Act, fair enough. I guess we should consider that. But we should not single out Tribes and make them subject to capricious, arbitrary, bureaucratic activity deciding on what their legal status is, what their rights are, and interfere with their ability to operate their own businesses, which are absolutely indispensable to supporting their governmental activities.

We do not give Tribes the power to tax. They can't tax their own land. They can't tax their own citizens. If they are not successful economically, they have to rely on the limited resources given by the Federal Government to do everything from protecting their citizens to providing healthcare for their citizens and to making sure that there is appropriate education for their citizens. They ought to be able to do what other governments do and earn money and run their own affairs.

We allow States to do that. We allow localities to do that. For almost 70 years, we allowed Indian Tribes to do that. Then we took it away from them. They are not even asking for something new. They are just asking for something that was taken from them, in terms of their authority and sovereignty, to be restored to them.

Mr. Speaker, again, I go back to urging the passage of the underlying legislation. I hope that we continue to work on these other issues that my friends have brought up. We are working on them in areas like CHIP, like the DACA question, and like the border security question.

But let's also take our time and pass this very important piece of legislation and restore to Indian Tribes what the National Labor Relations Board took away from them over a decade ago.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to address some of the things that my colleague, Mr. COLE, said. The big difference here between Tribal-owned and -run businesses and State and local governments is that State and local governments are not generally in the business of owning/operating companies. With very few exceptions, we don't have a socialist form of government in this country where cities or States are actually operating businesses in competition with the private sector.

Tribes, in addition to their Tribal workers, which are more analogous to State or local workers—and it is an appropriate discussion—also happen to own businesses, which is fine, and they produce revenue for the Tribes, which is great. However, they should play by the same economic rules as other businesses, which in no way impede businesses from succeeding in our country.

Of course, many of these Tribal-owned businesses are the main source of support and income for Tribes. If our labor laws work for any other business, they should also work for them.

American citizens, including Native American citizens of our country, don't lose their rights as workers because of the ownership of the organization and company that they happen to be employed by. That is a key tenet that needs to be balanced with, of course, Tribal sovereignty, which I am a strong supporter of.

If the discussion were simply about Tribal employees, it would be a different discussion. To be clear, it is about businesses that are owned by Tribes, and we simply don't have an analogy on the State and local side with very few exceptions. I am sure there is one somewhere. But, in general, municipalities and counties are not the owners of operating businesses that compete in the private sector.

Now, I want to talk about what is possible with regard to enhancing the rights of workers and labor. Instead of these kinds of policies that take away the rights of workers, including Native American workers, we should be moving forward on policies that put workers first.

My bill, the Giving Workers a Fair Shot Act, would do that. The bill would provide reasonable solutions to address the growing inequality in the United States by helping workers and ensuring that companies follow the law, emphasizing the need for corporate accountability.

It would remove unfair obstacles to forming a union, enhance transparency from employers, and increase penalties for violating our labor laws, which are strong but often not enforced.

First, all too often, employers frequently drag their feet on a newly formed union's first contract for months, sometimes for years, often with the goal of avoiding an agreement. Sometimes that means a newly certified union that the voters have voted in fails to receive a first contract.

My bill would set up a first-contract arbitration system where the union or the employer has the option of seeking mediation if they feel one party is not responding adequately to a negotiation request.

It would also ensure that no taxpayer funds are used for union busting or persuaders, activities like planning and implementing activities that deter employees from joining or forming a union. Again, it simply makes sure that no taxpayer funds are used for that explicit purpose.

Third, the bill updates the National Labor Relations Act's definition of ''supervisor.'' Too often, workers are reclassified as supervisors for effectively gerrymandering bargaining units. This updated definition helps prevent that sort of manipulation and would make it easier for employees to be able to form a union if they so choose.

Fourth, the bill reaffirms the importance for the government to protect workers from having their rights violated by increasing criminal and civil

penalties for individuals and executives who violate critical labor laws.

Injured workers and worker deaths should never be simply a cost of doing business. These robust protections help make sure that this is truly a criminal issue for the few bad actors that exist on the employer side.

Finally, the legislation empowers shareholders and creates new accountability for CEOs and executives by preventing the CEO and chairman at a publicly traded company from being the same person. We would all love to work for ourselves, but that is not in the long-term economic interest of the shareholders, the customers, or the workers.

The bill also expands insider trading restrictions for executives to 1 year after they leave a company.

In my district and across Colorado, people are clamoring for proactive policies that actually help address the income gap and put the needs of middle class families and workers first. Policies like the Giving Workers a Fair Shot Act would do that.

Now, this legislation that we are seeing here today is not the only controversial legislation we are seeing this week. Unfortunately, the next rule up will be one that takes away our constitutional rights as Americans.

The FISA reauthorization legislation has been described as a compromise, but that is not the case.

□ 1430

This legislation is not the necessary FISA reform bill that many in Congress, including myself, have called for, which is why I and so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are opposed to it in its form and support the Amash-Polis amendment, cosponsored by many others.

It is also why the current FISA reauthorization bill is opposed not only by privacy and civil liberties groups and consumers but also technology companies and job creators across the political spectrum. Businesses are, rightfully, afraid that, if this bill passes, it will make it even harder for American companies to engage in international commerce.

Many countries in Europe, for example, will simply refuse to do business with a technology company that is housed in the U.S. because they are afraid of what will happen to their citizens' data, perhaps even in contravention of their own stronger privacy laws.

This bill does not make any steps in the direction of reform that are necessary. It falls short on several grounds. In fact, in some ways, it makes the FISA program worse by codifying the ''abouts'' collections term that refers to the NSA searching through the internet traffic to collect not only communications to or from an intelligence target but also those that simply mention an identifier used by a target, even though that has been declared unconstitutional twice. It could be the name of a city or State or even a country that can be used as an identifier; in theory, subjecting close to 100 percent of tax and emails and internet traffic to warrantless searches.

This bill fails to consider the core concern that I have and that many Members on both sides of the aisle share; namely, the government's use of section 702 information against American citizens in investigations that have nothing to do with national security and does not require a warrant or the due process of our Constitution.

Instead, the bill codifies the ability of the government to access the content of our emails and telephone calls without a warrant. It creates an unprecedented and unworkable ''optional'' warrant, which is merely window dressing but does nothing to address the legitimate concerns.

These massive flaws could have been addressed, had we proceeded under regular order, but this version was reported only from the Intelligence Committee and bypassed the Judiciary Committee, which was cut out of negotiations when they agreed to go along with the Intelligence Committee railroading their committee. That is why I signed a bipartisan letter with dozens of our Members demanding FISA be handled under regular order.

I am proud to have offered the amendment that will be considered later with Representatives LOFGREN and AMASH and others that would provide a better path to keep American citizens safe and protect our privacy and ensure that American companies can remain competitive abroad. It will protect our constitutional rights and keep us safe.

My amendment, which is based off the USA RIGHTS Act, ends backdoor searches, ends reverse targeting, bans ''abouts'' collections, and strengthens FISA court oversight and transparency. I think these are all commonsense and necessary changes that Americans have been demanding for years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to oppose the FISA reauthorization and support the Amash-Lofgren amendment when they are brought forth shortly.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to a couple of my friend's points.

Let me begin by disagreeing respectfully with my friend's assertion that people are having their rights stripped away.

The only people losing their rights here are Indian Tribes. That is what happened when the NLRB did what it did. Without the direction of Congress or the administration, it decided on its own it would treat Indian Tribal governments different than it treated other governments. So it is those rights to the Tribal governments that we are busy trying to restore.

My friend, who, again, is very good on Indian issues, as a rule, and I understand the competing claims here. So I recognize the tension that is involved in that. But it is not as if Tribal governments don't have their own labor codes and their own standards. Frankly, those have to comply with American law.

Under the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1965, there is absolutely nothing that a Tribal government can do that would contravene the guaranteed rights in the United States Constitution for all Americans.

So to suggest that they are somehow violating the rights of American workers, I think, is to mischaracterize who they are and how they have acted. What they have said is, if we are sovereign, if the Federal Government says that State governments and local governments are allowed to regulate their own workforces, then Tribal governments are allowed to do the same.

I want to disagree also with my friend. There are lots of municipal golf courses in the United States. There are lots of municipal water slides. There are park systems. You can go to the State of Virginia and it happens to own the liquor business in the State. It has decided it is going to make that a State function. We don't regulate those employees.

So the idea that just because it is a money-making activity, that we then somehow treat it differently, we don't do that to any locality or any State in the country.

We just had an unelected Federal agency decide on its own it was going to do that to Indian Tribes. It is not doing it to anybody else, just to Tribes. I would submit that that is fundamentally unfair. Again, nobody's rights are taken away. Every American citizen has exactly the same right.

But if you were to go to work for the Federal Government, you don't have precisely the same rights you do in the private sector. The same thing is true here. If you choose to go to work for a Tribal government, you live within that regime. That regime has to comport with the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and you have not lost your action rights in Federal court if you think there is a violation.

So I think, frankly, this is a case that is crystal clear. You treat everybody the same way, every governmental unit the same way. That is all the Tribes are asking for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a distinguished member of both the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his work as the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that deals with funding public health as well as medical research.

I heard some comments about extension of the funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program at the beginning of the debate, and I wanted to

come to the floor and remind people that the Energy and Commerce Committee did do its work as far as continuing the funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program. It completed its work. We delayed a little bit at the request of committee Democrats, we delayed a little bit at the request of the ranking member of the full committee, but we did deliver a product the first part of October.

That product passed the floor of this House late October, early November. It passed with, of course, almost every Republican vote and over two dozen Democratic votes. It was, indeed, a bipartisan effort.

It funded the Children's Health Insurance Program for 5 years, which was the Democratic request; the funding levels were requested by the Democrats; and it was offset in a responsible way.

That bill is pending over in the United States Senate, and I, frankly, do not understand why the Senate minority leader will not release that bill for a vote by his Senators because it is, after all, Democratic Senators who represent States around this country that are going to suffer as a consequence of not passing this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to address something my friend, Mr. COLE, said.

Again, I am sure you can find a few instances in municipal and State government, but I am sure the gentleman would agree that, relative to size, they are very few and far between. Even most municipal golf courses are run by private operators under contract to municipalities. I am sure the gentleman can find a couple that aren't.

I have interacted with businesses in my district that are owned by Tribal nations, and I worked with them. There are a number of provisions in law that help them. I support those.

But I do believe that workers don't give up their rights simply because they work for a company that happens to be owned by a Tribal nation, as opposed to an American or even a Native American citizen of our country who, in their personal capacity, is the owner of a company and would not have the same ability to deprive workers of their rights as a company that was owned by his or her Tribe.

So, again, we want to make sure we support Tribal autonomy. And I do. Perhaps there is a bill to be had here, but it is simply not this bill.

I want to share a story of one of my constituents from Fort Collins, Colorado, that I think will bring this back to what our body should be doing.

I understand there are arguments on both sides of this. I understand there are people on both sides of the aisle who have concerns and also who support this bill. But it is not the urgency that we face with regard to deferred action or child health insurance.

In July of 2017, Carla and her husband from Fort Collins found out they were expecting another child. Both Carla and her husband work full time. Carla works at a local childcare center. Her husband works at a local retail store.

Even with their two full-time incomes, like many Americans, they felt the Children's Health Insurance Program was the only medical coverage for them, and Carla enrolled in CHIP.

Carla is due to deliver her baby in March of this year, but she worries that, when the baby comes, she won't have medical coverage anymore. Unfortunately, Carla is right to worry. Right now, Colorado is expected to run out of CHIP funding at the end of February, just a few weeks before Carla is due.

That is why this issue is so urgent, Mr. Speaker. For the tens of thousands of children and pregnant women, like Carla, we can't wait another minute to provide a permanent extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

But instead of finding a bipartisan fix for the Children's Health Insurance Program or for deferred action or to keep the government open, instead, here we have yet another bill that people will have different opinions on, and I feel that it undermines workers' rights and is not supportive in the way that I would be of the rights of our nations. It is, unfortunately, another example of misguided priorities.

We have precious little time—I believe 4 days—until the funding of the government expires. We should have acted on the Children's Health Insurance Program last year. We should have acted on deferred action last year. We need to act now.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I oppose the underlying bill, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, and I want to stress that, while we disagree on this, I appreciate his efforts in Native American issues. He has a record that, I think, is an excellent record overall. We just disagree very profoundly in this case.

I will say this: if you happened to just casually turn on the coverage of the debate at any point, you might wonder what we were debating about. In the course of the debate, we have talked about CHIP, we have talked about the DREAMers, we have talked about the budget, we have talked about FISA. We have spent a lot of time talking about a lot of different things other than the information at hand. I don't begrudge my friend. He feels very passionately about those areas.

It is interesting to me that, on the FISA issue, for instance, we will actually have a debate tomorrow. The amendment my friend supports will be in order tomorrow. We will have an opportunity to do that.

I think there are good faith efforts underway on both sides on the DACA issue and on the issue of FISA, particularly on the issue of the budget as well. Again, I wish this place worked a little differently. Sometimes deadlines are like alarm clocks here, but those things are underway.

What we are talking about today is also an effort that has been waged by Indian nations for over a dozen years to try and reclaim part of their sovereignty that was unjustly taken away from them.

I am going to disagree with my friend very profoundly. Nobody's rights have been taken away. Every American's rights are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The Indian Civil Rights Act of 1965 makes it abundantly clear no Tribe can do anything in contravention and restrict the rights of Americans.

The only people who have lost rights in this whole discussion and episode have been Tribal governments who had their right to regulate their labor affairs, the same way we allow States and localities to do it, taken away from them.

It wasn't taken away from them by an act of this Congress. We never passed legislation. It wasn't taken away from this because the administration ordered some agency of the executive branch to do something. It was taken away because, acting in a rogue manner, the National Labor Relations Board, on its own, decided it would expand its legal authority.

Well, that is great. They may have a case to make. But that is not what they are supposed to do. They are supposed to operate within the authority Congress gives them. If they think they need a grant of additional authority, they come to Congress and ask for that grant of additional authority. They don't simply, on their own, decide they will willy-nilly violate the rights of a sovereign Native American nation. That is exactly what happened in this case. Frankly, the Tribes have been extraordinarily patient in pursuing the remedy to this.

I think we ought to, today, take the opportunity to rectify a wrong that an agency of the executive branch did without the consent of Congress or even without the consent of the President of the United States at the time and allow Tribes to reclaim the authority that they exercised for over 70 years.

If we think we need to do something different in that regard, that is a fair point to make. If we do, it needs to be the same for State governments and local governments. You don't single Tribes out of sovereign entities and impose something on them that doesn't apply to everybody else that is a sovereign of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I encourage all Members to support the rule, but I recognize my friends probably will not, and that is fair enough. That is normal partisan debate.

But with S. 140, the House is taking steps to strengthen Tribal sovereignty. This body actually has a pretty good record. I worked with my friends across the aisle when we passed the Violence

Against Women Act, which had a very important component giving Tribes back some of the jurisdiction that they needed to regulate domestic abuse and sexual assault on their own territory.

□ 1445

My friends were overwhelmingly supportive and helpful in that measure. It would not have happened without them, so I know in many cases we do agree. But in this case, under this bill, Tribal governments will be able to be excluded from the requirements for employers under the NLRA, just like State and local governments.

This legislation will reverse the bureaucratic overreach of the NLRB and clarify the law once and for all. This bill is a commonsense solution that will clarify the original intent of Congress that the NLRA does not have jurisdiction over Tribal governments.

I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this work. We will actually have a split decision over this. There will certainly be some Republicans supporting my friend's position, but by and large, I think this House will do what it did the last time it considered this legislation, and that is, on a bipartisan basis, pass the law.

This time, given the action of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, we have every reason to believe the legislation will be picked up and sent to the President's desk, where I am confident it will be signed.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 681 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. 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. 3440.

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.

Mr. COLE. 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. POLIS. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 139, RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 682 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 682

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 139) to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-53 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, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (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 commit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. 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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 682, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of S. 139, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

The rule also provides for a motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule makes in order an amendment offered by Mr. AMASH, representing ideas from Members of both sides of the aisle.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee received testimony from numerous members, including Intelligence Committee Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF. We also heard from Judiciary Committee Ranking Member NADLER, Congressman FARENTHOLD, Congressman AMASH, Congresswoman LOFGREN, and also Congressman POE.

In addition to the vigorous debate on this legislation before the Rules Committee, both the Judiciary Committee and Intelligence Committee held markups on legislation to reauthorize section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Today we have the opportunity to pass an important piece of legislation that will enhance our national security and strengthen protections of Americans' privacy.

Mr. Speaker, I publicly thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman NUNES for their important work on this legislation. As a result of their efforts, the legislation we will consider today will protect the privacy rights of individual Americans without hindering the intelligence community's ability to gain valuable intelligence about the schemes and identities of our enemies.

Our government's most fundamental responsibilities are to defend the American people from harm and to protect their liberties. The value that we place on these duties is reflected by the fact that they are enshrined in the preamble to the Constitution.

To provide for our common defense, the dedicated men and women of the intelligence community work tirelessly to defeat the efforts of our foreign adversaries, whether they are terrorists, hostile foreign states, or nuclear proliferators.

Our Constitution tasks each branch of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—with constantly working to protect the liberty of every American.

With the bill provided for by this rule, the Chamber will be considering legislation that will help us better achieve both. The FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act will extend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, Title VII for 6 years while increasing oversight of its implementation at every level and providing more robust privacy protections for Americans.

Section 702 of FISA has proven to be an invaluable tool for collecting foreign intelligence and providing insight into the plans and intentions of our enemies. It is one of the National Security Administration's most important operational authorities.

It permits the government to conduct targeted surveillance of foreign persons located outside the United States, with the compelled assistance of electronic communication service providers, to acquire foreign intelligence information.

Mr. Speaker, this program's importance to national security cannot be overstated. While many of the examples of its successes are classified in nature, I can tell you here today that it has helped protect the homeland and the American people.

One declassified example that I can share with Members concerns the story of Hajji Iman, who rose through the ranks of ISIS, eventually becoming the terrorist organization's second in command.

For more than 2 years, the intelligence community searched for Iman. During that period, the NSA used their section 702 programs to target his communications and his close associates. Their resourcefulness, together with these 702 resources, eventually led them to him.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was a terrorist. He was a murderer. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Iman was killed by U.S. special forces on March 24, 2016, during an attempt to apprehend him.

We may not see every victory that the 702 program delivers on behalf of innocent Americans, but these initiatives help protect Americans every day.

Let us pause to note, however, that with the broad authority granted by a program like 702 to collect foreign intelligence information to fight our foreign enemies, it must come with expansive safeguards against abuse of that authority and expansive oversight of its use.

To ensure that the authorities under section 702 do not come into conflict with the liberty and privacy interests of the American people, the FISA Amendments Act expands substantially on the already extensive safeguard.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, each branch of government is responsible for protecting the liberties of the American people. In the executive branch, there are extensive internal controls that require agency heads and the Attorney General to review and approve of actions under 702. Additionally, the inspector general for the intelligence community and the Department of Justice are tasked with comprehensive review of this program's implementation.

Mandatory internal procedures known as targeting and minimization procedures also govern the collection, use, and dissemination of information, and they are in place at each agency that uses FISA section 702.

The FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act expands upon the internal protections by requiring each agency to also adopt querying procedures to control how each agency searches its database for 702-acquired communications.

This brings me to the judicial branch. Under current law, the targeting and minimization procedures must be approved annually by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, of FISC, which is made up of a rotating group of Article III judges.

The FISC, with the aid of amicus curiae briefs and technical experts, engages in exhaustive review and consideration of section 702's implementation for compliance with the Constitution and the law.

This legislation will enhance the FISC's considerations of privacy issues by providing the FISC with the authority to compensate amicus briefs and technical experts.

Finally, there is Congress, where we come to. The Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Intelligence have conducted multiple oversight hearings and meetings in both classified and unclassified settings. Numerous insights came from those hearings, and the legislation that will be considered under today's rule reflects them well. The bill makes a number of improvements that will enhance the congressional oversight in coming years.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is time to remember one more group that remains critical to protecting Americans' liberties: American men and women themselves.

This legislation will improve transparency and public oversight of FISA section 702 by requiring the Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General to conduct a declassification review and publicly release the FISA section 702 minimization procedures every year.

Mr. Speaker, the most important reform contained in this legislation constitutes the most substantial reform to the program since its inception.

Under this legislation, the FBI will be required, when conducting a criminal investigation of a U.S. person, to obtain a warrant from the FISC prior to accessing the content of the communications that were acquired using 702.

Section 702 information is collected for the purpose of foreign intelligence operations, and this critical new requirement forecloses the possibility that FBI agents investigating Americans for traditional crimes would be able to use 702 information in such domestic investigations.

In addition to the numerous safeguards currently in place and added by this legislation, Americans are guaranteed their right of privacy by the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

I took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, and the oath guides every action I take in this Chamber. The FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act ensures that the Fourth Amendment rights of Americans are upheld and includes additional safeguards on top of constitutionally guaranteed rights.

Mr. Speaker, we have reviewed the importance of the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act in stopping terrorist attacks and protecting the American people, but this point bears repeating: this program allows the government to obtain the communication of foreigners outside the United States, including foreign terrorist threats, in support of the counterterrorism efforts worldwide. It has allowed us to respond to threats to our country.

Now let me tell you a little bit about what the 702 program is not. It is not a bulk collection of data. It cannot be used to target Americans and it cannot be used to target individuals located inside the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act is an example of what Congress can accomplish when we work together to find solutions to our Nation's weightiest challenges.

Mr. Speaker, before I close my opening, I also will acknowledge that there is a lot of difference of opinion, as there should be, on this bill. But at the end of the day, progress has been made, protections have been implemented, and the security of our country must be taken into account. That is why this bill needs to pass and any amendments that were brought forward need to fail.

We need to push this forward and begin the process in continuing to protect our private citizens' personal responsibilities and liberties, but also, at the same time, making sure that our intelligence communities and those entrusted with the sacred duty of protecting this country have the tools they need to do that. Anything else would be less than what we should be here.

Mr. Speaker, 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 gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today with the rest of my Democratic colleagues in utter amazement at the dizzying dysfunction exhibited by our friends across the aisle. For reasons beyond understanding, we have to vote on the reauthorization of section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act because late last year the Republican leadership chose to prioritize massive tax cuts for their wealthy donors over the safety of American citizens.

□ 1500

Like so many other important issues, House Republicans decided to punt on the reauthorization of 702 by simply extending it to January 19 of this year, coincidentally, the same date the government will possibly shut down.

Mr. Speaker, as a former judge and the former vice chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I do occupy a unique vantage point in the ongoing debate between the need to steadfastly protect the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution while also ensuring that those in the intelligence community have the tools they need to keep our country safe from those who wish to do us grave harm.

Putting the finer points on this debate aside for a moment, I can tell you with complete certainty that such a debate deserves to be lengthy and thorough, neither of which have happened here.

I was concerned to learn, if not a bit dismayed, that the House Intelligence subcommittee which has oversight jurisdiction of the National Security Agency did not hold a single hearing on today's bill. In fact, the full committee did not even hold a single hearing on this important piece of legislation.

Think about that. As the Republicans approached the need to discuss the reauthorization of one of the more important tools to fight terrorism that, simultaneously, brings along legitimate and important Fourth Amendment concerns, the majority, in all their wisdom, thought it prudent to hold exactly zero hearings on such an important matter. That is a brazenly inept way to govern.

To add insult to injury, I am told that members of the committee were given about 36 hours to read the bill before having to vote it out of committee.

A side note here: the bill they were given 36 hours to review is not actually the bill we have before us today because the majority had to use a Rules Committee print to fix some of the most troublesome parts of the original bill in order to obtain my friend Ranking Member ADAM SCHIFF's support. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, that support did not come easily, and important changes were made to the bill as it was presented to the committee in its original form.

For example, Mr. SCHIFF was able to ensure the Republicans' unmasking language was removed from today's bill. The removal of such language ensures that one of the Republicans' most heinous political stunts is not codified into law. This was and is a significant improvement.

Moreover, the Republicans removed the controversial expansion of the definition of ''agent of foreign power,'' which concerned privacy and technology groups.

Today's bill also addresses what is known as ''abouts'' collection. This is the collection of communications that are not to or from a target but, rather, communications that merely reference the target. The NSA, itself, shut down this collection method earlier this year.

The legislation before us today will allow such collection to resume, but only if the NSA first devises a way of doing so that addresses privacy concerns, obtains permission from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, and Congress does not object after a 30-day review period.

Now, this may seem to be a better option than what I am sure many, if not most, Republicans wanted, which is the full-scale reimplementation of ''abouts'' collection, but considering how much difficulty the majority has in simply keeping the lights on around this place, I think it is fair to question their ability to provide meaningful oversight in just 30 days. Again, this is simply evidence for the need to return back to regular order under which bills are fully and fairly considered.

Regardless of where one comes down on this issue, I can assure you that there are Members on both sides of the aisle that are sick and tired of being shut out of important policy discussions concerning subjects like those before us today.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), a fellow member of the Judiciary Committee and former chair of that committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 139, which is the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act.

I have stood on this floor debating the PATRIOT Act after 9/11. I fought for reforms in 2015 with the USA Freedom Act. And now here we are debating the latest need to balance privacy and security.

Since Congress last reauthorized section 702, we have learned a great deal about the operation of this program. These revelations have highlighted the risks that it poses to privacy and civil liberties. This program needs to be reformed, but, Mr. Speaker, this is not the bill to do it.

Rather than provide meaningful reforms, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act would reauthorize section 702. However, as we are all well aware, the program routinely sweeps up millions of innocent Americans' emails.

The warrant requirement in this bill applies to only fully predicated, official investigations and not to the hundreds of thousands of searches the FBI runs every day just to run down a lead or check out a tip. The loopholes are too great to ensure proper protections.

In this morning's Washington Post, on page A4, an article says, in part, FBI officials told aides of the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), last week ''that under the proposed bill, they anticipate rarely, if ever, needing permission from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to review query results, according to one of the aides.'' And this was not denied by

the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

We are going to hear an awful lot about warrants on the floor and how this fixes the problem, but here the FBI has said in no uncertain terms to one of our congressional aides that they are never going to have to use this warrant requirement, which was drafted by the Justice Department that has opposed warrants all along. If ever we have seen the fox not only watching the henhouse but inside the henhouse, this is it. It isn't even a fig leaf being small or otherwise. It is simply a way to divert the attention of this Congress away from what is really going on.

Furthermore, the bill would provide a path for the NSA to restart the practice of ''abouts'' collection, which has been described by the ranking member. The proposal grants some committees 30 days to review any effort to turn ''abouts'' collection back on, giving Congress little or no say on this matter. We all know that we can't do anything in 30 days around here, and yet the bill restricts us from doing that.

Finding a bipartisan and balanced solution is very possible. I know because I have done it twice with the PATRIOT Act and the Freedom Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. The House Judiciary Committee passed the USA Liberty Act with bipartisan votes. This bill fails to do these necessary reforms. The program should be reauthorized if done in the right way. This bill is the wrong way. It is time for Congress to put the F for ''foreign'' back into FISA. There is no F for ''foreign'' in this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my friend from the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. SENSENBRENNER for the reasons he has outlined that this bill should not become law. However, I am also speaking in favor of the Amash amendment that has been put in order that would fix the problems that he has so eloquently outlined.

Before 702 was enacted into law, the NSA and the FBI would need to get a probable cause warrant to collect this information. We made a major change that allows this information to be collected when a foreigner is communicating with an American, and when you go to the ''abouts'' collection, which the underlying bill would codify, even when that doesn't occur, when there is merely discussion of a foreigner. That is not what I think our Constitution requires. And we did not outsource to the judicial branch or the executive branch the decision on what the Constitution requires us to do.

Now, we have learned that there is a vast amount of information being collected—we can't go into the details of that in an open session, just that we have been told by Admiral Rogers the scope of this—and that the database that is so-called incidentally collected because of the architecture of the internet could be searched for Americans without a warrant is not consistent with the protections outlined in the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution.

The Amash amendment, which is basically the USA RIGHTS Act, ends these backdoor searches by requiring a warrant. It ends reverse targeting. It bans the ''abouts'' collection and prohibits the collection of domestic communications, prevents the misuse of information on Americans, and is something that we should support.

Now, in a letter to the Senate in October, a coalition of groups said this:

> The USA RIGHTS Act, which is essentially the Amash amendment, is markedly superior to all current legislative proposals to reauthorize section 702.

Who said that?

The American Civil Liberties Union and FreedomWorks, the NAACP, but also the Project On Government Oversight, and Color of Change. This is a broad, left-right coalition that has come together, even though there are many things we disagree on, because we agree on one thing: When we took an oath to defend the Constitution on our first day of this session, we didn't take that oath to defend the Constitution when it is convenient or when we feel like it. No. We took that oath to defend the Constitution every day, in every way, and with every bill. And without the Amash amendment, this bill falls short.

Just a note on where we are in the timing. It is true that this has been delayed, I would say unconscionably delayed, for this proceeding. But we have more time than has been suggested.

Under the existing act, it provides that, if there is an existing order from the FISA court, that order remains in effect even if the underlying bill lapses. We have an order that extends into late April. So we have a deadline, but it is not this week and it is not next week. We owe it to our constituents and we owe it to our obligation to the Constitution to get this right.

When JIM SENSENBRENNER, who is someone whom nobody is going to question his conservative credentials, and when Judge POE, ZOE LOFGREN, and JERRY NADLER come to the same agreement on the Constitution, I would hope that our colleagues would listen. Vote for the Amash amendment, and, if it does not pass, vote against the bill.

□ 1515

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my next speaker, there are a couple of things to clarify here.

This is an urgent matter. Although the gentlewoman spoke of this in the sense that the existing orders would stay in place, she fails to mention, and others have failed to talk about, that any new orders or even currently existing orders are being enforced by the intelligence community, which is set under that sort of pale of direction that they want.

So I guess if you are satisfied protecting the country with existing orders and existing threats that lasted yesterday, but I will guarantee you somebody else woke up this morning wanting to do us harm. I want the intelligence community to be able to address that in a way that is prudent and proper, which is what I feel like is happening here.

The other issue here is, and I want to make this very clear, there are strong opinions, and I respect the gentlewoman from California immensely, I have relayed and have had similar concerns that she has had over the process and I have voted with her several times to move forward, but we have moved forward, and there are, I believe, protections in this bill.

So when we also talk about, as we go forward, and there is going to be a lot of passionate rhetoric, who is looking out for whom and reminding us of our oaths, I took the oath here, just as the gentlewoman did, when we started this new session, but I also took another oath in the United States Air Force and also served in Iraq and also serve in that time since currently in the military, and we have that oath as well.

I will not take a backseat to anyone who can consciously disagree about where we are. This is a good bill. This is something that I would love to see in different ways changed, but this is the arc of where we are now in protecting our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of reauthorizing FISA 702.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about unconscionable delaying tactics or talking about the need for regular order. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that just today on this floor, we have watched, once again, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle playing games. We have had this particular debate now delayed by the games that their Members have been playing over the course of the last several hours with motion after motion to adjourn. That is, Mr. Speaker, what I believe is unconscionable.

This is a bill that is a bipartisan bill. The ranking member of the Intelligence Committee as well as the chairman of the Intelligence Committee worked very hard to come to agreement on this bill.

I would argue, if anything, Mr. Speaker, the bill goes too far in terms of beginning the process that we cannot begin of putting walls up.

All of us lived through 9/11, and we know, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that we saw that day was what can happen when we make it much more difficult for our law enforcement and our intelligence agencies to connect the dots, much more difficult for them to stop terrorist attacks against this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that goes directly towards those issues. This is one of the most important pieces of policy and of authority that the National Security Agency has. I think it is very important for people who are listening to this debate to recognize that this authority is an authority that allows surveillance of foreign nationals on foreign territory, not in the United States.

I would urge my colleagues, particularly when we have got a bill that is a bipartisan product, that is a product that has been worked on and agreed to in a bipartisan manner, that it is unconscionable for them to delay, unconscionable for them to hold the Nation's security hostage.

We are seeing it, Mr. Speaker, not just with respect to this particular piece of legislation, but we are seeing it, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the entire negotiations underway today over the budget for the Nation.

We have seen a situation where, as they did today, they are trying to accuse us of holding DACA hostage, of holding DACA individuals hostage. That is not what is happening, Mr. Speaker.

The Democrats in this House, Mr. Speaker, are, in fact, holding our national security hostage, and they are doing it with respect to the funds that our military needs as well.

We are a nation today that is facing grave and growing threats. We are a nation that is putting tremendous demands on our intelligence service, on our intelligence professionals, and on our men and women in uniform. I think that every Member of this body who decides to play games, rather than do what is right and what is necessary and what our constitutional obligation and our oath requires, ought to think as they are doing that: What does it mean to the mothers and fathers across this Nation who have children who are deployed for the defense of the Nation, the mothers and fathers across this Nation who know that we are sending their children into harm's way?

The Democrats in this body, Mr. Speaker, consistently continue to hold up the funding that our military needs and, in this case in particular, to hold up the reauthorization of this crucial piece of policy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the reauthorization of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am amused by my friend from the Rules Committee's assertion that today, because of protests with reference to DACA, members of my party were protesting that concern.

I am also amused that they are in the majority, and she accuses us of delaying, when, in fact, this measure was scheduled 2 or 3 months ago and could have been brought to the floor, but, no, they were busy about tax cuts, and so they didn't get around to allowing for this important matter to be brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) to respond to the gentleman from Georgia.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to respond.

The NSA will not go dark, and I think it is important that we understand that.

We are collecting the content of phone calls, emails, text messages, videos, pictures of Americans, putting it in a database and querying it, searching it without a probable cause warrant. That is the state today, and that will continue until reform is done. It will not go dark. I thought it was important to make that clear.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, I know he wanted to yield to my colleague from the Judiciary Committee, to have the chance to clarify that.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from California attempting to clarify.

Again, I stand by my statement. The simple fact is, it is the statement it will not go dark, but the issue is we go further here in the collection happening, but how we use that and how we deal with that in a national security context, there is an interesting issue here, and there is an issue that could keep us from doing what we need to do.

Again, this is the debate that we can have, this is the debate that we need to have on this floor, but there is a difference of opinion here. In this instance, I think with the pervasive efforts put in place, I believe that this program is one worth keeping.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), a former FBI special agent.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of reauthorizing section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which is due to expire.

As a 14-year FBI special agent, including significant time as a counterterrorism agent, I am an eyewitness to the importance of this program and the deliberate and lawful manner in which it is used.

The fact is, section 702 is a critical tool that the intelligence community uses properly to target non-U.S. persons located outside of the United States to acquire information that is vital to our Nation's security.

Equally as important, this crucial program has operated under strict rules and has been carefully overseen by all three branches of our government to protect the privacy and civil liberties of all Americans.

As we have seen, both in our country and abroad, proper surveillance and law enforcement is vital to protect us against terror attacks, especially lone attacker scenarios. As terror groups like ISIS continue to lose territory in Iraq and Syria, our intelligence community has warned that we will see more of these one-off attacks as opposed to more traditional conspiracies.

At a hearing of the Homeland Security Committee, I asked FBI Director Chris Wray about this program as part of our national security posture. He said, despite the high volume of threats, there are few dots that can actually be connected in regard to these ''more loosely organized situations.'' Information already lawfully obtained by the FBI is crucial in, as he said, understanding ''which threats are real and which ones are more aspirational.''

Section 702 allows the national security professionals to query information to determine whether a tip from State or local law enforcement or others is credible, and it begins the process of marshalling resources to head off potential threats.

Allowing section 702 to expire would leave America vulnerable at a time when we need this protection the most. As Director Wray clearly stated: ''If 702 is walked back, we will be . . . starting to rebuild the wall that existed before 9/11.''

Mr. Speaker, with today's terror landscape, we cannot go backwards when proven, legal means exist to keep Americans safe.

I urge my colleagues, Democrat and Republican alike, to support this vital national security measure. The safety and security of the families we represent depend on the passage of this measure. Let us get this done for them.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations and a good friend of mine.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Florida for his astute assessment and analysis in his earlier remarks today, particularly sharing with us his experience on the Intelligence Committee, and I thank him for mentioning the fact that I serve as the ranking member on the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee.

In that capacity, that committee certainly encounters not only our Nation's law enforcement but many of the issues dealing with terrorism, including the work on homeland security.

With that in mind, I want to simply say to my colleagues and, certainly, to my good friend, who served and dedicated his life to the FBI for 14 years, none of us over the past couple of

months will take a backseat to championing the FBI, thanking the FBI, recognizing the FBI for the very valiant work that it does.

Being on the Judiciary Committee for the number of years that I have served, I have worked with almost every FBI Director, and agents, particularly the SACs in my particular jurisdiction, and have been engaged in discussions on the resources and needs of that organization. Mr. Speaker, again, we thank them for their service.

I would offer to say that the position I take today is to protect the FBI and to protect the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD, interestingly enough, an article written by SHEILA JACKSON LEE, ''Protecting America, protecting Americans,'' dated October 16, 2007.

[From the POLITICO, Oct. 16, 2007]

PROTECTING AMERICA, PROTECTING AMERICANS

(By Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee)

Nearly two centuries ago, Alexis de Tocqueville observed that the reason democracies invariably prevail in any martial conflict is because democracy is the governmental form that best rewards and encourages those traits that are indispensable to martial success: initiative, innovation, resourcefulness and courage.

The United States would do well to heed de Tocqueville and recognize that the best way to win the war on terror is to remain true to our democratic traditions. If it retains its democratic character, no nation and no loose confederation of international villains will defeat the United States in the pursuit of its vital interests.

A major challenge facing the Congress today is to ensure that in waging its war on terror, the administration does not succeed in winning passage of legislation that will weaken the nation's commitment to its democratic traditions.

This is why the upcoming debate over congressional approval authorizing the administration to conduct terrorist surveillance on U.S. soil is a matter of utmost importance. I offer some thoughts on the principles that should inform that debate.

In the waning hours before the August recess, the House acceded to the Bush administration's request and approved the woefully misnamed ''Protect America Act,'' which gives the federal government enlarged powers to conduct electronic surveillance of American citizens under the guise of conducting surveillance of foreign terrorists.

Fortunately, the authority conferred by the PAA expires next February.

It is therefore incumbent on the Congress to act expeditiously to amend the PAA so that it achieves the only legitimate goals of a terrorist surveillance program, which is to ensure that Americans are secure in their persons, papers and effects, but terrorists throughout the world are made insecure.

The best way to achieve these twin goals is to follow the rule of law. And the exclusive law to follow with respect to authorizing foreign surveillance gathering on U.S. soil is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Enacted by Congress in 1978, the exclusivity of FISA was undisputed. Any legislation authorizing terrorist surveillance programs which the administration seeks to conduct must explicitly affirm that FISA is the sole basis of lawful authority for conducting foreign surveillance gathering on U.S. soil.

That FISA remains the exclusive source of authority does not mean that the law cannot be adapted to modern circumstances or revised to accommodate new technologies. One widely acknowledged reform is to amend FISA to make clear that foreign-to-foreign communications are not subject to FISA, even though modern technology enables that communication to be routed through the United States.

Additionally, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court is indispensable and must play a meaningful role in ensuring compliance with the law.

Legislation must ensure that the FISC is empowered to act as an Article III court should act, which means the court should operate neither as a rubber stamp nor a bottleneck. The function of the court is to validate the lawful exercise of executive power on the one hand, and to act as the guardian of individual rights and liberties on the other.

Congress should reject any proposal that grants amnesty to any telecommunications company or other entity or individual that helps federal intelligence agencies spy illegally on innocent Americans.

Amnesty will have the unintended consequence of encouraging telecommunications companies to comply with, rather than contest, illegal requests to spy on Americans.

The only permissible path to legalization of conduct in this area is full compliance with the requirements of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Finally, authorization to conduct foreign surveillance gathering on U.S. soil must never be made permanent. The threats to America's security and the liberties of its people will change over time and require constant vigilance by the people's representatives in Congress.

In short, it makes much more sense to enact legislation that protects Americans, rather than one that protects America, as the administration's proposal claims to do. At bottom, America is its people connected to each other, and to past and future generations, as in Abraham Lincoln's unforgettable phrase, by ''the mystic chords of memory stretching from every heart and hearthstone.''

America, in other words, is Americans coming together in a community of shared values, ideals and principles. It is those shared values that hold us together. It is our commitment to those values that the terrorists wish to break because that is the only way they can win.

Thus, the way forward to victory in the war on terror is for this country to redouble its commitment to the values that every American will risk his or her life to defend. It is only by preserving our attachment to these cherished values that America will remain forever the home of the free, the land of the brave and the country we love.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, that article suggests that we have the responsibility to protect America and Americans. I would make the point to my good friend, who mentioned that men and women or families sending their young people over to battlegrounds, they are absolutely right, and those young people who are going over to battlegrounds are going over on the basis of freedom. Their parents sacrificed, these loved ones sacrificed their young people because they believe so much in the freedom of this Nation.

Well, I will tell you that section 702 and the underlying bill, there is no freedom in this particular bill, and that is why we need to address the question in a thoughtful manner. I don't mind if we extend this to have a longer debate so that we can work through some of our concerns.

Let me be clear that S. 139 fails to address the core concern of Members of Congress and the American public. The government's use of section 702 information against United States citizens in investigations that have nothing to do with national security, that is the crux of our advocacy for both the Amash amendment, joined by myself and ZOE LOFGREN and TED POE and many others—it is not to undermine the security of this Nation. It is to give substance to those families who sacrifice and send their young men and women to faraway places.

The warrant requirement contained in the bill is riddled with loopholes and applies only to fully predicated official FBI investigations, not to the hundreds of thousands of searches that the FBI runs every day to run down a lead or check out a tip.

S. 139 exacerbates existing problems with section 702 by codifying the so-called bulk collection, a type of surveillance that was shut down after it twice failed to meet the Fourth Amendment scrutiny.

S. 139 is universally opposed by technology companies, privacy and civil liberties groups across the political spectrum.

Let me read briefly what the Amash amendment really says. It is not something that would stop security, surveillance, and work in its tracks. What it does is, ''Except as provided in subparagraph C or D, no officer, agent, or employee of the United States may conduct a query of information acquired under subsection A in an effort to find communications of or about a particular person if there is reason to believe such person is a United States person,'' protecting the First Amendment freedom of speech and all of that, but matched with the important amendment of the Fourth Amendment, which, of course, is unreasonable search and seizures.

□ 1530

An application by the Attorney General to a judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that describes the determination of the Attorney General is probable cause to believe that such communications provide evidence of a crime, such person is a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power. This is a minimal standard.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a minimal standard of which every American should expect and is owed. It is a minimal standard upon which we stand the Constitution.

We are missing what our role is here. It is not to rush through a FISA bill that has been delayed by my Republican friends. More importantly, it is to

do right by the American people. We are not doing right by the American people.

I remember fighting against reverse targeting, a major issue in our work on the Freedom Act and the PATRIOT Act. Now, today—in 2017, going into 2018—in 2018, it is important to remember that 9/11 was to not turn terror on Americans; it was to protect us from terrorism and to withstand that with the upholding of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I rise in opposition to the rule for S. 139, the ''FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017,'' and the underlying bill.

S. 139 reauthorizes Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which is scheduled to expire on January 19, 2018.

Although Section 702 is a critical national security tool set to expire on January 19, 2018, events of the recent past strongly suggest that Section 702 should not be reauthorized without necessary and significant reforms that are not included in the legislation before us.

So as the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I oppose the rule and underlying bill for several compelling reasons:

1. S. 139 fails to address the core concern of Members of Congress and the American public—the government's use of Section 702 information against United States citizens in investigations that have nothing to do with national security.

2. The warrant ''requirement'' contained in the bill is riddled with loopholes and applies only to fully predicated, official FBI investigations, not to the hundreds of thousands searches the FBI runs every day to run down a lead or check out a tip.

3. S. 139 exacerbates existing problems with Section 702 by codifying so-called ''about collection,'' a type of surveillance that was shut down after it twice failed to meet Fourth Amendment scrutiny.

4. S. 139 is universally opposed by technology companies, privacy, and civil liberties groups across the political spectrum, from the ACLU to FreedomWorks.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us comes from the Intelligence Committee, where it was passed on a strict party-line vote.

This stands in stark contrast to H.R. 3989, the USA Liberty Act, I the bipartisan bill reported by the Judiciary Committee after multiple hearings, an open markup process, and a bipartisan vote of approval.

The USA Liberty Act enjoys much broader support, contains meaningful reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and is far superior to the bill before us.

FISA was enacted in 1978 to provide the Executive Branch with a statutory framework for gathering ''foreign intelligence information'' from U.S. persons.

FISA authorizes special court orders for four purposes:

1. electronic surveillance;

2. physical searches;

3. the installation and use of pen registers and trap and trace devices; and

4. demands for the production of physical items.

Although FISA is designed for intelligence gathering, and not for the collection of criminal evidence, the law applies to activities to which a Fourth Amendment warrant requirement would apply if they were conducted as part of a criminal investigation.

Most commonly, authorization for a wiretap or physical search under FISA is obtained by application to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (''FISC'' or the ''FISA court'').

Section 702 is part of the FISA Amendments Act (FAA), a successor to the Bush Administration's unlawful warrantless wiretapping program that ended in January 2007.

The FAA adds a new Title VII to FISA that grants the government the authority to monitor electronic communications of non-U.S. persons abroad.

Section 702 authorizes the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence ''to acquire foreign intelligence information'' from ''persons reasonably believed to be located outside the United States.''

Although the FAA prohibits the intentional targeting of persons in the United States, the FAA had been in place for only a few months when the New York Times reported that the NSA had ''overcollected'' domestic communications, a practice described as significant and systematic, even if unintentional.

Subsequently, the Director of the Office of National Intelligence stated that ''it is not reasonably possible to identify the number of people located in the United States whose communications may have been reviewed under the authority of the FAA.''

Section 702 provides that the government ''may not intentionally target a person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States if the purpose of such acquisition is to target a particular, known person reasonably believed to be in the United States.''

Mr. Speaker, Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act was enacted to protect the liberty and security of Americans, not to diminish their constitutional rights.

That is why Section 702 should not be reauthorized with reforms to prevent the government from using information against its political opponents or members of religious, ethnic, or other groups.

One way to do that is without interfering with the national security objectives of 702 surveillance is simply to require the FBI to obtain a warrant before reading communications by Americans, when it finds those communications by targeting that American and searching its 702 databases.

Enforcing the warrant requirement would prevent the misuse of Section 702 to conduct ''backdoor searches'' where government agencies, including individual FBI agents, may search the communications collected under section 702 for communications by an individual American, read those communications and disseminate them within the government, all without any external oversight, much less a judicial warrant, simply by claiming a ''foreign intelligence'' purpose.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans want to find a common-ground where common-sense rules and regulations relating to fighting terrorism at home and abroad can exist while still protecting the cherished privacy and civil liberties which Americans hold close to our collective hearts.

Mr. Speaker, I noted in an op-ed published way back in October 2007, that as Alexis DeTocqueville, the most astute student of American democracy, observed nearly two centuries ago, the reason democracies invariably prevail in any military conflict is because democracy is the governmental form that best rewards and encourages those traits that are indispensable to success: initiative, innovation, courage, and a love of justice.

The best way to keep America safe and strong is to remain true to the valued embedded in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The bill before us does not strike the proper balance between our cherished liberties and smart security.

We can do better; we should reject this rule and the underlying bill and bring to the floor for debate and vote H.R. 3989, the USA Liberty Act.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just real briefly, I think one of the issues here is this discussion of riddled with loopholes and riddled with anybody. It is just a reminder that agencies not already defined in this cannot just do random searches of this database. This is something that we have just—again, let's just push back on the facts of the case.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to say ''pause,'' take a step back, reject the rule, and give ourselves a chance to, frankly, do it better.

FISA reauthorization is inarguably one of the most consequential votes we will take in this Congress because the constitutional stakes are so high. Civil liberties are the core of our Bill of Rights, and we are asked to take action that affects them in the name of keeping us safe. I get that.

But it is critical that we get it right. I think we can do better. To make decisions of this magnitude, we should have the most robust process possible, full and open debate, and input from the stakeholders, thoughtful deliberations by the Members. The process for this bill thus far has decidedly not been that, has not been great. It was written and rewritten in secret and with minimal debate or stakeholders' input.

But—this is a big but—I am actually optimistic because I have seen a change in the last few days and I think we have an opportunity here. The administration is suddenly engaged, and we are seeing vibrant debate from stakeholders in the technology sector, civil liberties advocates. Members have had very serious discussions, including here on the floor today, but in the Halls, offering amendments to rules, unfortunately, which are not being allowed—save one.

We are being asked to shut all that down, that opportunity, and push through an extension that will run for 6 years. Frankly, stop and think: 6 years in the world of technology is an eternity.

So, for all these reasons, I ask my fellow Members to join me in opposing this rule and, instead, allow the House an opportunity to work its will, to take a little more time, and to do it better because we really do need to wrestle with privacy, with what privacy means in a world where our entire personal lives are stored somewhere online as ones and zeros. Frankly, that is happening at an even faster pace than it is now.

We need to debate how the Fourth Amendment protects us against search and seizures applying to our digital records. We are all being rendered into nothing but a massive storehouse of ones and zeros.

The tensions or balance between civil liberties and national security is a debate as old as this country, but they are not mutually exclusive. They are hard—they are darn hard—but they are not mutually exclusive and they are not impossible.

I know well how many threats we face around the world and I don't take them lightly. The fact that we have not faced another major terrorist attack since 9/11 is a testament to the skill and the hard work of the intelligence community, and I tip my hat to them. I am absolutely committed to giving them the tools they need to keep us safe, consistent with our constitutional rights.

But we live in an era of the most powerful spying tools the world has ever known. Twenty-five years ago conversations were ephemeral. They were conducted in person or over the phone. But now they occur over email or chat and they are archived forever. Our medical, financial, and legal records are all online; so are our photos. Our cell phones track us everywhere we go.

The data available on us is unprecedented, and the fundamental principle of the Bill of Rights is that we have the right to keep our data private. We need new safeguards to ensure that.

So, by rejecting this rule, we have a chance to do it better. In so doing, both keep us safe and protect our constitutional rights.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the rule.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how much time is remaining on both sides, and then also inquire of my good friend from Florida if he has any more speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Does the gentleman from Florida have any more speakers?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would advise that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the United States House of Representatives is known as the people's House, yet the people's representatives continuously are shut out of policy discussion after discussion. They are shut out of writing bill after bill, and they are shut out of offering any meaningful amendments.

Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, if the people's representatives are shut out, then the people are shut out. If you look around at how the majority is running this place, through a historically closed process, the result is not at all pretty.

I have some advice for my Republican friends. If, like this side of the aisle, you spent more time working on policies that help the American people instead of the wealthy and rich corporations who are, I might add, doing just fine, you would likely not only see more legislative successes, but you would be able to spend more time on important issues like this critically important issue, the extension of section 702.

Mr. Speaker, as is clearly evident, Democrats remain ready to work in a bipartisan manner to accomplish all that remains left to do for the American people. We are ready to fund the government and provide for smart investments for the future of our country.

We are ready to pull the hundreds of thousands of DREAMers out of unnecessary limbo and provide them with the status they deserve. We are ready to go forward with comprehensive immigration. We are ready to provide the funding and authorization needed to give millions of low-income children the health insurance they need. We are ready to fix our roads and our bridges and our railways and air trafficking. We are here and waiting, but time is running out.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Florida, my cohort on the Rules Committee, but I will just also say I appreciate his advice. But also, as a reminder back to my friend from Florida, we have spent time talking about things that matter and things that were messed up.

In fact, we spent a lot of time in this House and passed a healthcare bill because people in my district called me regularly over the holiday, as the new year approached, saying: We can't get insurance, or the insurance that I am provided, no doctor will accept.

We have spent time on that. I believe that is real.

We spent time in this body over the past few years working on a bill called Dodd-Frank that, in my district, decimated community banks and made lending harder and made businesses have more trouble trying to hire people to put them to meaningful work. Yes, we are spending time on things that were not well thought out.

Tax reform was well thought out and is helping Americans in all districts, including my friend's, and I believe we will continue to hear more about that as the day progresses.

But today, again, as many times, we are focused on a bill that has serious debate. It has the reality of some that can take and look at one thing and see a difference, and I agree with my friends on that. But that is why we are having this debate. That is why there will be an amendment on this bill that I oppose and that others will. Some will support it.

But I tell you one that does not support it: the current administration does not support the amendment. The current administration supports the bill, and the relevant committees that have worked on this bill support the underlying bill.

Number two, one of the issues that we have talked about today and one of the things we have to be very careful of is going back to something that was supported by both parties, and that is the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission report that said that we have to take seriously the foreign—I respect greatly my friend, former speaker on our side, who disagrees with this bill, but this is about foreign surveillance. This is the foreign part of this, and we have got to make sure that we have that capability.

Really, this bill—if you continue, and especially looking at the amendment and where others want to go—would build walls that led to the very problems that we expressed before 9/11.

Then there is this last case that continually comes up, and it was about the ''about collection,'' which is no longer being done and practiced. It has been said: Well, we are just codifying it, and they can bring it back willy-nilly.

Let's remind ourselves of what actually has to happen. They have to actually decide that, one, they can, and they have to bring it to the FISC, the court. Oh, wait. Hold on here a second. Let's think about what just happened here. They have to bring it back to the very court that said: Oh, we have got a concern about this and why they have suspended it.

But, Mr. Speaker, let's also talk about why this even occurred, to start with, with the court. It was because the agencies, the intelligence communities, self-reported an issue that they needed to look at. It was not hidden. It was self-reported to the court. This is the protections built into this legislation.

Now, we can debate whether they go far enough or they are not enough or they are properly billed. This is sort of like a debate that needs to happen.

But be careful where we go here, to let the American people be led to believe that things that are happening are not really happening. Do not let it be led to believe that there are not things in place set up by even friends who have spoken today, maybe even against this, that were put in place to

protect the personal rights of our citizens.

Let's never forget that the end result of this is keeping our Nation safe while balancing the privacy concerns of our own citizens, which is never outside of my thoughts and discussions.

For years, the five years that I have been in this body and worked on the Judiciary Committee, we have pushed this envelope, pushing it for protection while, at the same time, balancing our national security needs. I will never say, for the most part, that there is a perfect bill ever to hit this floor. I would think that my friend would probably agree with me on that.

So you have to find the balance and ask: What is the aim of the bill? What is it doing? And how did it go about.

I believe this strikes that balance.

You can have disagreement, but at the end of the day, my question to you is: Is your push to make something better willing to turn out the lights or go dark on watching those who wish to do us harm?

Don't bank on the fact that the intelligence community will just continue on under what has been happening and not look at what could happen, even as we are in this Chamber debating this bill. I want them to be able to see clearly the threats to this country. I want them to use the processes in place to protect American citizens in this process, which they are doing, which, by the way, was highlighted by the fact of the self-report that led to the unbalanced collection being stopped.

□ 1545

But I never would want to put the security of this country in doubt when they cannot look or they are on shaky legal ground of what they can and cannot do to protect us. This goes back to a time in our country's history where we have technology—it was just said recently—that is changing. I want them to have the ability to continue this process under the supervision of a plan that is put in place. Where those need to be adjusted, they can be adjusted.

Are there other needs that need to be addressed? Yes, there are. The Intelligence Committee chairman and I have spoken on those already. The Judiciary Committee, also, is looking into these. But at this point in time, this bill is one that I believe strikes the balance that is critical for our intelligence and law enforcement communities to have the tools they need to do their jobs, for our civil liberties and right to privacy, fundamental to our identity as Americans. I believe the underlying bill strikes that proper balance.

As we go forward, these are the debates, Mr. Speaker, we need to have in this Chamber. At the end of the day, it is about getting the bill and the process right so that we can achieve the aims that need to be achieved.

As we move forward, I would say this is what happened, this is how we work, and, for now, I believe this is the proper way to go about it. I look forward to supporting this rule and the underlying bill to protect our Nation, the American people, and also to preserve our civil liberties.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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.

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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 682 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 681; and

Adoption of House Resolution 681, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 181, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—233

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
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
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
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
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
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
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
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
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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—181

Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
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
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
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
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
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
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Adams
Carbajal
Cicilline
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Gabbard
Hanabusa
Jenkins (WV)
Keating
Kind
McHenry
McNerney
Nolan
Poe (TX)
Scalise
Turner
Wilson (FL)

□ 1613

Ms. SPEIER and Mr. GOTTHEIMER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. BILIRAKIS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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, on rollcall No. 8 on H. Res. 682, the rule providing for consideration of S. 139, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017, I am not recorded due to my attendance at a briefing on airport security. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

□ 1615

HONORING DON YOUNG AS DEAN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a very happy purpose, and it is to recognize the Honorable DON YOUNG of Alaska as the new dean of the House of Representatives.

The tradition of having a dean dates back centuries to the House of Commons. It is an honor that goes to our longest continuously serving Member.

DON YOUNG is one of only 28 Americans in the history of this Nation to serve more than 40 years in this House. As you can see, he has a very bright future ahead of him.

DON, I want to be clear at the outset that there are limits to the dean's duties. For instance, you cannot hang a bearskin in the House Chamber. You still cannot reserve seats.

The dean has the responsibility of swearing in the Speaker. Remember, that is swearing in the Speaker, not swearing at the Speaker.

This milestone is not just a matter of longevity, but the word that comes to mind when you think of DON YOUNG is ''loyalty.'' This man is fiercely loyal. DON YOUNG is fiercely loyal to Alaska.

He fights hard for what he believes is right. Just look at ANWR. I know it is controversial. We have been talking about doing tax reform for 30-plus years here. DON YOUNG has been working on ANWR for 45 years. When we passed H.R. 1 in the House, that was the 13th time he passed an ANWR bill, and it finally made it into law.

Achievements like this just don't happen overnight. They require leaders willing to carry the torch, come what may. As we all know, DON YOUNG is not the kind of guy that is going to let anything—or anyone—get in his way.

He is loyal to his family and his friends, which includes many, many Members of this body. He can be direct, but you always know where he stands, or, more importantly, you always know where you stand with him.

But most of all, as our dean, DON YOUNG is loyal to this institution. That, we all know. Decades on, DON YOUNG believes as much as anyone in the value of the work that we do here. As DON, himself, so characteristically put it: ''those who think . . . I might retire, you can forget it. I like what I do.''

DON YOUNG is a man of this institution. He believes in this institution. He believes in the work that we do.

So, on this, his 16,374th day in the House, we extend our congratulations to DON, to Anne, and to their entire family.

I thank DON YOUNG for his service to Alaska and to this country.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN DON YOUNG

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join our distinguished Speaker in honoring Congressman DON YOUNG, who ascends to the position of dean of the U.S. House of Representatives following nearly 45 years of proud service on behalf of the people of Alaska. Congressman YOUNG also holds the distinction of serving as the first dean of the House from the Republican Party in 80 years.

Congratulations.

On behalf of the Democratic Caucus, I extend my congratulations to DON; his wife, Anne; and his entire family.

Despite our differences, it is clear that DON cares deeply about our Nation. DON serves because, in his words, he is ''enthusiastic about meeting people and trying to solve their problems.''

As a former teacher, he is an advocate for quality education for all. As a former U.S. Army tank operator, he believes in ensuring that servicemembers, families, and veterans have the care they have earned. In honor of his late, beloved wife, Lu Young, he has been a champion for the Native children of Alaska.

The motto of the State of Alaska is ''North to the future.'' In his commitment to progress and better futures for the people of Alaska, DON honors those words.

The dean of the House has the honor of administering to the Speaker, as the Speaker indicated, the oath of office, which begins: ''I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.'' As dean, Congressman YOUNG will now have the special responsibility not only of defending the Constitution, but of defending the integrity and dignity of this institution, which he has done all along.

Following in the footsteps of great leaders before him—Sam Rayburn, John Quincy Adams, Carl Vinson—it is now DON's solemn duty to help foster a climate of civility in the Congress and to hold our colleagues accountable for behavior beneath the standards of this body.

I told DON I would tell you this story when I just congratulated him. He has been very helpful to us in making the Presidio go from an Army post to a special kind of national park. I hope he considers establishing the Presidio in San Francisco part of his legacy. We would love to welcome him and honor him in San Francisco anytime he is ready for that.

But in the course of our conversations over those times, I noticed one day that DON had on this beautiful tie. It had a bald eagle and a baby seal on it. It had these beautiful animals on it. I said: DON, what a lovely, beautiful environmental tie you have on.

He said: I call it lunch.

Again, we know that DON YOUNG will always honor the important obligations, as he always has, and now his new obligation as dean of the House of Representatives. That is historic.

I congratulate him and thank him for his service.

SERVING THE PEOPLE OF ALASKA

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the Speaker and the minority leader for their introductions.

I have been in the House for 45 years, with nine Speakers and nine Presidents. I have been in this House with 2,000 Members who have left. I love this body.

I can suggest one thing: My greatest honor has been being able to achieve results for my State. I am the only Congressman from the whole State of Alaska, and I love it. It is my responsibility to represent the State and this House as the single person to do the job that I have been asked to do.

One of the things that I have enjoyed is the friendships. I don't think there is an enemy in the House. I worked across the aisle. Jimmy Oberstar and I never had an adversarial vote at any one time on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Now, when George Miller was the minority member, we had a lot of arguments and a lot of disagreements, but we hunted together and we ate together.

I believe in bipartisanship. I believe in this body to lead this Nation. Nine Presidents, the House has its job to do regardless of who the President is.

I thank my wife, who is in the audience up there in the gallery. A man gets lucky usually once in his life. I got lucky twice. My past wife was with me for 46½ years. My new wife has been with me about 8 years now. I want the State to pay her because she keeps me alive. And she likes what I do.

I want to thank my colleagues. Being the dean will not change me. I will still holler, ''Vote.'' I will sometimes get out of line. But in doing so, remember,

it comes from my heart, and my heart is in this House.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 140, AMENDING THE WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). 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. 681) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 140) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund, 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 will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 181, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
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
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
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
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
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
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
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
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
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—181

Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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
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
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
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

NOT VOTING—16

Adams
Carbajal
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Gabbard
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Jenkins (WV)
Kind
McHenry
McNerney
Nolan
Scalise
Turner
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1633

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. 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 227, noes 181, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

AYES—227

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
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
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
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
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker

Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—181

Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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
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
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
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

NOT VOTING—23

Adams
Barr
Brooks (IN)
Carbajal
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, Sam
Kind
King (IA)
McHenry
McNerney
Nolan
Scalise
Turner
Walters, Mimi
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1641

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.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1645

AMENDING THE WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 681, I call up the bill (S. 140) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 681, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–54 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

S. 140

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

SECTION 1. USE OF FUNDS IN WMAT SETTLEMENT FUND FOR WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.—Section 307(a) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat. 3080) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting '', (b)(2),'' after ''subsections (a)''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 312(b)(2)(C)(i)(III) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat. 3093) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '', including the planning, design, and construction of the WMAT rural water system, in accordance with section 307(a).''.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA LAND ELIGIBLE FOR 99-YEAR LEASE.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (commonly known as the ''Long-Term Leasing Act'') (25 U.S.C. 415(a)), is amended—

(1) by striking ''Indians,,'' and inserting ''Indians,'';

(2) by inserting ''Ohkay Owingeh pueblo,'' after ''Cochiti,'';

(3) by inserting ''the pueblo of Santa Clara,'' after ''Pojoaque,'';

(4) by striking ''the the lands'' and inserting ''the land'';

(5) by striking ''lands held in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Clara,''; and

(6) by striking ''lands held in trust for Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo''.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION OF EMPLOYER.

Section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 152) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or any Indian tribe, or any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian tribe and located on its Indian lands,'' after ''subdivision thereof,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(15) The term 'Indian tribe' means any Indian tribe, band, nation, pueblo, or other organized group or community which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

''(16) The term 'Indian' means any individual who is a member of an Indian tribe.

''(17) The term 'Indian lands' means—

''(A) all lands within the limits of any Indian reservation;

''(B) any lands title to which is either held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any Indian tribe or Indian or held by any Indian tribe or Indian subject to restriction by the United States against alienation; and

''(C) any lands in the State of Oklahoma that are within the boundaries of a former reservation (as defined by the Secretary of the Interior) of a federally recognized Indian tribe.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMALFA. 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 S. 140.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 140, as amended, which consists of three sections promoting Tribal self-governance and sovereignty over their lands, resources, and businesses belonging to Indian Tribes.

Section 1 of S. 140 amends current law to ensure the completion of a Tribal water system in Arizona. It makes a technical amendment to the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify that authority exists for any necessary cost overruns associated with the Tribe's rural water system, provided it falls within the existing authorization level.

This provision provides the White Mountain Apache Tribe and the Department of the Interior certainty that there will be sufficient funds to complete the rural water system.

Section 2 of S. 140 is identical to S. 249, a bill referred to the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs, which I chair. The Natural Resources Committee reported S. 249 favorably on July 24, 2017, by unanimous consent.

Section 2 amends what is commonly known as the Long-Term Leasing Act, to authorize two Indian pueblos in New Mexico to lease their restricted fee lands for up to 99 years, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Such leases may be for a variety of nonmineral development purposes. While current law generally authorizes Indian Tribes, subject to the approval of the Secretary, to lease their trust and restricted lands, the terms of the leases may not exceed 25 years.

This bill would authorize the pueblos of Santa Clara and Ohkay Owingeh to lease their restricted fee lands for terms of up to 99 years.

Congress has amended the Long-Term Leasing Act more than 40 times to adjust the terms and conditions of leases of Indian lands and to authorize leases of specific Indian lands by their Indian owners for a term of up to 99 years, subject to the approval of the Secretary.

While the Natural Resources Committee does not have jurisdiction over section 3 of S. 140, I wish to express my full support for promoting Tribal self-governance by giving Tribes parity with States and local governments for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act.

Tribal self-governance, or sovereignty, means that a Tribe may make its own laws and be governed by them. Since President Nixon launched the era of Indian self-determination, Tribes have shown that when they assume management and control over their affairs, they actually outperform the Federal Government.

Thus, section 3 of S. 140 will continue and enhance the policies of Tribal self-determination that have almost always enjoyed strong bipartisan, bicameral support for these measures.

S. 140, as amended, is fully consistent with promoting this important Tribal economic opportunity and freedom to do as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Today, we are debating a bill package that follows a very familiar playbook for House Republican leadership.

This bill package is just the latest attempt by my Republican colleagues to push a highly partisan agenda by combining that divisive proposal with noncontroversial items.

Today's bill includes two bills that passed Senate and House Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent.

One of these bills would make a technical correction to a previously passed Tribal water settlement, and the other would clarify that two pueblos in New Mexico should receive equal treatment when leasing their lands.

Unfortunately, instead of quickly passing these bills and suspensions and sending them to the President to be signed into law, House Republican leadership has decided to take those two bills hostage and combine them with a highly divisive bill that is likely not going anywhere—H.R. 986, section 3 of this legislation—which I do not support.

This political stunt seems doomed to fail. The only thing it will accomplish is wasting everyone's time.

Meanwhile, a list of bills that are critical to Tribes across the country sit in the Natural Resources Committee and are just ignored by the majority.

For example, we could be moving legislation that would protect and preserve Native American cultural artifacts, or legislation that would address issues at Indian Health Service, or legislation to codify meaningful and robust Tribal consultation process; or we could be here today passing the bipartisan bill known as the ''clean'' Carcieri fix.

These bills deserve attention. They are promoted by not only Indian Country, but many, many Members in a bipartisan fashion in this House.

I hope we can move past these petty political games soon, which people are, rightfully, sick of having to see.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to change course and stop blocking consensus bills from moving through this body by conjoining them with divisive, contentious proposals.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of S. 140.

I strongly support this bill, but I want to speak today about one particular piece of it—the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act—which I helped introduce, along with Mr. ROKITA.

Mr. Speaker, I often stand in this House to oppose interference from the heavy hand of the Federal Government, and this is no different.

In 2004, the National Labor Relations Board, unilaterally, decided that it needed to meddle in the affairs of Tribally owned businesses on Tribal lands. This is a board that was set up to oversee union elections but has become the bureaucratic arm of big labor.

By further expanding its jurisdiction, the National Labor Relations Board threatened the foundation of Indian law, the principle of Tribal sovereignty, and the limits of a small Federal Government.

Since the Obama administration implemented this incredible government overreach, dozens of Tribes have supported legislation to clarify that the NLRB's jurisdiction does not extend to Tribes. The conservative, small government legislation we consider today would make that necessary correction.

Native American Tribes around the country, and especially in my home State of South Dakota, are plagued with grinding poverty, high unemployment, substance abuse, and poor healthcare. They continually seek economic development through self-determination, and the last thing that they need, when trying to improve economic opportunities for their citizens, is a Federal bureaucracy further meddling with their efforts.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that subjecting Native American Tribes to National Labor Relations Board rules is yet another sign that some still want the Federal Government to interfere with Tribal decision-making.

I have sponsored the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, and this House has passed it multiple times.

I am proud that many South Dakota Tribes have long supported the bill, including the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, the Oglala Sioux Tribe, and the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association.

I urge my colleagues to withdraw the heavy hand of government and again support Tribal sovereignty.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 140.

As has been pointed out, buried in section 3 of this otherwise noncontroversial water and lands bill is the text of H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. This nongermane provision would strip thousands of employees of their rights and protections under the National Labor Relations Act at Tribal enterprises located on Tribal lands.

At issue in the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act are two solemn and deeply rooted principles:

First, the right that Indian Tribes possess in matters of local self-governance;

Second, the rights of workers to organize unions, bargain collectively, and engage in concerted activities for mutual aid and protection.

Rather than attempting to balance these two important principles, the bill chooses sovereignty for some over the human rights of others. I would note that the approximately 75 percent of workers employed at Tribal casinos are not members of the Tribes running the casino, but this bill would strip labor rights of hundreds of thousands of these workers as well as those who are actually members of the Tribes.

In doing so, this legislation would abandon the carefully drawn balance between Tribal sovereignty and workers' rights that was adopted in the San

Manuel decision by a Republican-led National Labor Relations Board in 2004. Perhaps prompted by litigation, the board ruled that the National Labor Relations Act will only apply if it does not impact the exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters or abrogate rights guaranteed by treaties.

The San Manuel decision is based on legal principles governing Federal laws of general applicability with respect to Indian Tribes that have been upheld by appeals courts for over 30 years. That is why courts have ruled that Tribes must comply with labor and employment laws such as the Fair Labor Standards Act; the Occupational Safety and Health Act; the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA; and the employer mandate of the Affordable Care Act.

Yet this bill singles out the National Labor Relations Act on the grounds that Tribes must be given parity with State and local governments which statutorily are exempt from the NLRA. Maybe States and localities should have been considered, but the statutes are clear that they are exempt.

This is not a reason why Tribes should be exempt from an otherwise generally applicable law. Furthermore, State and local governments are covered under title VII of the Civil Rights Act; whereas, Tribes are expressly exempt.

For employees of Tribal enterprises, therefore, unions are the sole protection under Federal law against discrimination, including sexual harassment, because they can negotiate a collective bargaining agreement that enforces employees' rights to be free from such conduct.

Democrats and Republicans together have insisted that our trading partners abide by and enforce basic labor rights anytime we do a trade deal. And Congress has repeatedly required these obligations in trade agreements, but today the House will vote on a bill that takes away the assurance that employees have for the freedom of association if they are employed in many Tribal casinos.

This creates a fair question: Would this legislation place the United States Government in breach of any of the trade agreements that are now in effect? According to the International Labor Organization, in an opinion on a similar bill a few years ago, it would, in fact, put us in breach of trade agreements.

We should be able to fashion compromises that, frankly, protect both workers' rights and Tribal sovereignty, but what is before us today fails that test. There is no principled basis for stripping hundreds of thousands of workers from the right to join a union and negotiate better wages simply because they happen to work in a commercial enterprise on Tribal lands.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding and for his work on this bill.

As he mentioned in the opening statements, there is a provision in the bill that allows the Santa Clara Ohkay Owingeh 99-year leasing program to move forward. That is in resolution to the long-standing problems that we face there. So just a significant provision that affects these two units but also the underlying concept that we are going to recognize the sovereignty of our Tribes.

As many people know, some of the Tribes are faced with just very difficult poverty conditions throughout the history of their Tribes since they have been on the reservations, and I work with close friends of mine who are trying to solve these problems and to find resolution to long-term prosperity on the Indian reservations.

So when the National Labor Relations Board reversed its long-standing status of recognizing the sovereignty of our nations—70 years they had recognized that. In 2004, they simply reversed it without much explanation, without any warning, and certainly without precedent.

□ 1700

It has caused things to be much more difficult, especially in States like New Mexico. So the Tribal leaders are saying: We should be sovereign. We should be allowed to make these sorts of decisions ourself without the Federal Government coming in and putting the bureaucracy there.

The underlying concept of the bill is one that simply says we want prosperity on Native American lands, we want their sovereign actions to take care of themselves, to move themselves forward. That is what the entire Nation says is the American Dream. Let's let that occur for the Native Americans in this country. I think the provisions of the bill are very important.

We have been working for 6 years now in Native American housing, another way to help move prosperity into Native American lands. Again, I support the concept of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 140 because it includes H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2017.

The effect of this legislation would be to strip employees who work at businesses owned and operated by an Indian Tribe and located on Indian lands of the protections afforded by the National Labor Relations Act.

I am a Chamorro, one of the native people of the Northern Marianas, and I fully appreciate the importance of Tribal sovereignty for Native Americans. However, this legislation does not properly reconcile the competing interests between sovereign rights and the rights of workers.

At least 75 percent of employees at Tribal casinos are not Tribal members. In some cases, as few as 1 percent of the employees are members of the Tribes operating the casino. These workers have no say in the decision-making of Tribal governments.

Workers have the right to organize, to collectively bargain, and to protect their right to fight for a safe workplace, fair pay to provide a living for themselves and their families, and good benefits. They should not be stripped of these rights simply due to the geography of the workplace.

Federal law and Tribal sovereignty should be able to coexist at Tribal casinos without stripping workers of their rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S. 140, which would strip protections from workers who are employed by a Tribally-owned business but are not Tribal members. This includes protection from harassment and discrimination in the workplace.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which prohibits employers from discriminating against employees, does not apply to Tribal enterprises. A non-Tribal worker employed by a Tribally-owned casino, for example, cannot file a harassment or discrimination claim in Federal court or with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Instead, collective bargaining agreements fill the gap by including provisions that enforce their right to a fair workplace.

By stripping their collective bargaining rights, this legislation eliminates the only recourse that these workers have against discrimination and harassment. This is one of the many unacceptable consequences of this bill.

Now, I have two letters. One from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and one from the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, both of which raise strong objections to the majority's attempt to exclude workers from the rights enshrined in the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include these letters in the RECORD.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS,
Washington, DC, December 6, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, I am again writing to

express our strong opposition to H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. This legislation would exempt all Tribally-owned and -operated commercial enterprises on Indian lands broadly defined from the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). We urge you to vote no when the House considers this legislation.

If H.R. 986 were to become law, hundreds of thousands of workers at these enterprises, including Teamsters, would be stripped of their protections and rights under the NLRA, including the right to organize and collective bargaining. It would deprive both Tribal members and non-member employees of the right to form or join unions and to bargain collectively for better wages, hours, and working conditions. We should be working to expand the rights and ability of workers to earn a decent living for themselves and their families and to secure a safe and healthy workplace.

While Tribal casinos have been the focus of discussion, this legislation affects not just casino workers. Since the 1980's Tribes have expanded business interests beyond casinos. They now operate many different revenue producing commercial enterprises—construction companies, mining operations, and power plants, to hotels, water parks and ski resorts, to name a few.

In 2004, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) (in San Manuel) ruled that Tribal casino workers should have NLRA protections. Shortly after the San Manuel decision, legislation, in the form of amendments, was twice offered to block the NLRB from enforcing the San Manuel decision.

These amendments were rejected. Since then, the NLRB has proceeded in a measured fashion asserting jurisdiction on a case-by-case basis. The NLRB will not assert jurisdiction where it would interfere with internal governance rights in purely intramural matters or abrogate treaty rights. Otherwise, the NLRB will protect workers' rights at tribally owned enterprises by asserting jurisdiction. With its case-by-case approach, San Manuel takes a careful approach to balancing of tribal sovereignty interests with Federal labor law.

It should be noted that other important federal laws that protect workers apply to Indian businesses, such as the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, and Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Indeed, courts have denied attempts to gain exemptions on numerous occasions ruling commercial tribal enterprises should not be excluded from such laws. NLRA rights and protections should not be treated differently.

Proponents assert that they are seeking the same exemption as state and local governments. However, this is inaccurate, The NLRA only exempts actual government employees and not private sector employees performing contracted out government functions. Also, a substantial majority of workers at these enterprises are not Indian or Tribe members, and thus have no ability to influence tribal governance, since non-tribal members are prohibited from petitioning a tribe.

The bill could also undermine enforcement of existing labor contracts and the decision workers made to organize and bargain collectively. When a collective bargaining agreement expires, a Tribe could unilaterally terminate the relationship with the union without consequence under the NLRA. The employer's obligation. to bargain could be eliminated.

Employees of tribal enterprises have no constitutional rights to protect against employers. Only the NLRA gives them free speech rights. Absent the NLRA they have no protection. Workers cannot be left without any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively just because they are employed at tribally owned enterprise.

Finally, the United States requires its trading partners to implement and abide by internationally recognized labor standards, while H.R. 986 deprives workers at these tribal enterprises of these core rights—the right to organize and bargain collectively.

To focus solely on the NLRA raises the question of the true motivation for this legislation. It is regrettable that the principle of tribal sovereignty is being used to cloak an attack on the basic rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively. The Teamsters Union respects tribal sovereignty. However, we do not believe that this principle should be used to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. We urge you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act and to VOTE NO on H.R. 986 when the legislation comes to a vote in the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL–CIO,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2018.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing to urge to oppose S. 140, as currently amended to expand the exemption of employers under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

S. 140, as amended, is Just another attempt at passing the so-called Tribal Sovereignty Act, which would deny protection under the NLRA to many workers employed by tribal-owned and -operated enterprises on Indian land. A great majority of these workers are not Native Americans and in recent years there has been a substantial expansion of enterprises that would be impacted by this legislation, including not only casinos, but mining operations, power plants, saw mills, ski resorts, high-tech firms, hotels, and spas.

AFSCME supports the principle of sovereignty for tribal governments, but does not believe that this principle should be used to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. We oppose any effort to exempt on an across-the-board basis all tribal enterprises from the NLRA, without regard to a specific review of all the circumstances, as is currently provided by National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) standards. Workers must not be left without any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively, especially in instances where they are working for commercial operations competing with other businesses.

AFSCME strongly urges you to oppose S. 140, as amended, when it comes before the House for a vote.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this Federal Government has had a very spotty record over the many decades of its treatment of Native American Indian Tribes in this Nation, and for us to not act in order to countermand what the National Labor Relations Board has done on its own would be a mistake. It would be wrongheaded, in that if we are going to have the types of relations, these government-to-government relations with Indian Tribes in this country, that level of respect, then Congress needs to act, Congress needs to maintain that relation.

So for local governments, State governments to have this protection from the NLRA and the Tribes not to, then we would be making a severe mistake to not take action here today with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for all portions of S. 140 today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I respect and support Tribal sovereignty. I also support workers' rights to unionize and collective bargaining to improve their workplace and the lives of their families. Those rights must be balanced, but they are not in this bill.

Union members have a collective voice to fight for higher wages, better benefits, safer workplaces, fewer injuries, fewer deaths, lower rates of gender-based violence.

After Unite Here, a union, found that 58 percent of hotel workers and 77 percent of casino workers in the Chicagoland, where I am from, had been sexually harassed, they won a contract that includes panic buttons to protect workers.

Labor rights are fundamental, but under this bill, workers at Tribally-owned businesses, casinos and hotels, construction, and other industries would lose those rights.

Remember, three out of four workers employed in Tribal casinos are not Tribal members. Those workers could end up with no way to bargain for fair wages, appeal unfair disciplinary action, or act against sexual harassment.

Looking at a similar bill in the last Congress, the International Labour Organization stated: ''It would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the National Labor Relations Act and its mechanisms would give rise to a failure to ensure to these workers their fundamental freedom of association rights absent any assurances that there were Tribal labor laws that provide the same rights to all workers.''

Mr. Speaker, there is no such requirement in this bill. Protect workers. Reject this unfair and unbalanced bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the opinion from the International Labour Office.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE,
Genève 22.

Mr. R.L. TRUMKA,
President, AFL–CIO,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. TRUMKA: I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 22 October 2015 requesting an informal opinion and guidance from

the International Labour Organization in respect of a Bill being considered by the United States Congress.

In particular, you have raised concerns about the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 511) which you state would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of a large number of workers employed by tribal-owned and tribal-operated enterprises located on tribal territory and ask for the informal opinion of the Office as to whether such an exclusion of workers employed on tribal lands would be in conformity with the principles of freedom of Association which are at the core of the ILO Constitution and the ILO's Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.

In conformity with the regular procedure concerning requests for an informal opinion from the International Labour Office in respect of draft legislation and its possible impact on international labour standards and principles, the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labour standards or principles on freedom of association.

Your links to committee reports of the congressional majority and minority and other background information have enabled the Office to consider the views of the parties both for and against the proposed amendment and they all appear to confirm recognition of the United States' obligation to uphold freedom of association and collective bargaining. While the proponents of the Bill assert that this can be achieved through the labour relations' regimes autonomously determined by the tribal nations, the opponents—and you yourself in your request—maintain that excluding tribal lands from the NLRA will in effect result in a loss (or at the very least inadequate protection) of their trade union rights. Not only do you refer to tribal labour relations ordinances which in your view provide inadequate protections in this regard, but you also refer to instances where there are no tribal labour relations ordinances at all.

While elements of indigenous peoples' sovereignty have been invoked by the proponents of this Bill, the central question revolves around the manner in which the United States Government can best assure throughout its territory the full application of the fundamental principles of freedom of association and collective bargaining. From an ILO perspective, while the variety of mechanisms for ensuring freedom of association and collective bargaining rights may differ depending on distinct sectoral considerations or devolution of labour competence, it is critical that the State (the national authority) takes ultimate responsibility for ensuring respect for freedom of association and collective bargaining rights throughout its territory.

As you have indicated, the 2004 San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino decision assures possible recourse to the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), an overarching mechanism aimed at ensuring the protection of freedom of association, while also maintaining deference to the sovereign interests of the tribal nations so as to avoid touching on exclusive rights of self-governance.

Full abdication of review via an exclusion from the scope of the NLRA for all workers employed on tribal lands as described might make it very difficult for the United States Government to assure the fundamental trade union rights of workers. In cases like those mentioned where there are no tribal labour relations ordinances, undue restrictions on collective bargaining, excessive limitations on freedom of association rights or lack of protection from unfair labour practices, workers on tribal territories would be left without any remedy for violation of their fundamental freedom of association rights, short of a constitutional battle. Furthermore, the exclusion proposed, with no avenue for federal review or overarching mechanism for appeal should there be an alleged violation of freedom of association, would give rise to discrimination in relation to the protection of trade union rights which would affect both indigenous and non-indigenous workers simply on the basis of their workplace location.

Given the concerns that you have raised, it would be critically important that, at the very least, a complete legal and comparative review be undertaken to support assurances that all rights, mechanisms and remedies for the full protection of internationally recognized freedom of association rights are available to all workers on all tribal lands. In the absence of such assurances, it would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the NLRA and its mechanisms would give rise to a failure to ensure to these workers their fundamental freedom of association rights.

In accordance with ILO procedure concerning requests for informal opinions on draft legislation, this communication will also be brought to the attention of the United States Government and the representative employers' organization, the US Council for International Business.

Yours sincerely,

CORINNE VARGHA,
Director of the International Labour Standards Department.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 140, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, a provision in the pending legislation that will end the National Labor Relations Board's alarming overreach into businesses operated on sovereign Tribal lands.

In March of 2017, the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, which I have the privilege of chairing, held a hearing on this legislation and heard from Native American business leaders on how the NLRB's arbitrary use of its jurisdiction had been harming businesses large and small on Tribal lands.

Leaders of the Native American community testified before the subcommittee on how the NLRB had meddled in the day-to-day operations and management of Native American businesses, often dragging out matters for years.

To make matters worse, the proceedings led by the NLRB are creating burdensome legal costs for businesses who are seeking to provide high-quality goods and services to Native American communities.

While members of the NLRB have changed and have begun to make great progress in reversing some of the Board's most damaging decisions, Congress needs to make it clear that Tribal labor sovereignty must be safe from future Washington overreach.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act will clarify the National Labor Relations Act and reverse the troubling encroachment of the Federal Government on Tribal lands.

Congress has the opportunity here to stand up for sovereign rights of Native Americans and the businesses they own and operate on their lands. These Tribes have created their own system of labor protections for employees and employers consistent with their lands and traditions, and it is not for Washington bureaucrats to tamper with those protections.

I urge my colleagues to support the sovereignty of all Native American Tribes and pass the underlying bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the bill before us that takes away National Labor Relations Act protections for hundreds of thousands of workers.

I support Tribal sovereignty. In my home State of Wisconsin, I am proud the Ho-Chunk Nation is in my district. Potawatomi, Oneida, Menominee, St. Croix, Stockbridge-Munsee, Lac du Flambeau, Lac Corte Oreilles, Red Cliff, Bad River, and other Tribes all reside in my home State, and I am glad to support the autonomy of those Tribal nations. But this bill isn't about Tribal sovereignty. It is about going after workers' rights.

Look at the track record of the majority in this Congress. The Republicans have continued to go after workers' rights, as they have so far. They have repealed the rule that required companies seeking large Federal contracts to disclose violations of labor law. They made it harder for people whose jobs are shipped overseas to get unemployment insurance. They have made it harder for workers whose employers don't offer retirement plans to save for retirement. They have repealed an OSHA rule requiring employers to maintain accurate records of serious workplace injuries for 5 years, while the administration drastically reduces the number of OSHA inspectors.

This bill isn't about meaningful sovereignty. It is about selective sovereignty, because it only goes after labor rights.

If this were a bill about sovereignty, it would include a number of other areas that Tribes are compelled to follow in addition to the National Labor Relations Act: the Occupational Safety and Health Act; the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA; the Family and Medical Leave Act; and the public accommodations of Americans with Disabilities Act, just to start.

If this bill was about sovereignty, it would exempt OSHA and ERISA and the FMLA and the ADA, for starters. But it doesn't do that. This bill only exempts labor protections for hundreds of thousands of workers, Tribal members and nonmembers, because the majority in this Congress isn't really worried about sovereignty. It is concerned

about taking away the rights of workers, and that is what this bill is really about.

Mr. Speaker, if this body wants to help Tribes, I am here to help. Bring a bill to the floor that covers all exempted areas, and that is a bill that I could support. But that is not what is in front of us today.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of opposition from the International Union of Operating Engineers, the United Auto Workers, United Food and Commercial Workers, and Unite Here.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The International Union of Operating Engineers opposes the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, legislation contained in S. 140 (115–54) that would eliminate the labor protections currently guaranteed to hundreds of thousands of American workers. Indeed, if enacted into law, this bill would constitute the biggest rollback in labor law since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947.

The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) represents nearly 400,000 men and women across North America. Members of the International Union of Operating Engineers maintain and operate Native American and non-Native American gaming facilities around the United States, from Connecticut to California, and this legislation would have a dramatic effect on their lives and livelihoods. The IUOE is the second-biggest union in the hospitality sector. But this legislation extends beyond casinos and gaming. IUOE members work in mining and energy facilities on Native American lands in a number of locations, and those workers eventually could lose their rights as a result of this legislation.

In a few short words, this bill changes current law by exempting the National Labor Relations Act from tribal enterprises on tribal lands. Today, the National Labor Relations Board (Board) implements a case-by-case review of whether labor law applies to tribal enterprises.

The precedent-setting case that comes from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians is instructive. The Tribe operated a 92,000–sq.ft. casino (over two acres), with 1,400 employees. Only five of the workers were Native American. The Board determined that this large commercial establishment should not receive the exemption from labor law provided to states and local government because its operations were fundamentally different than a government. The San Manuels were not providing a public good to members of the tribe. They were not behaving like a government. Instead, the Board determined that when the tribal operation in question is commercial in nature, employs significant numbers of non-Indians, and caters to a non-Native American clientele, ''the special attributes of sovereignty are not implicated.'' The Board determined that private labor law applies to the San Manuel casino, just as it would with any other commercial operation. Federal courts have supported this interpretation. Sovereignty does, however, apply to governmental functions of the tribe, just as they would with any state government.

If passed, the exemption from labor law would unfairly advantage commercial tribal operations at the expense of non-Native American private-sector companies. Competitors with Native American commercial operations must comply with labor law; Native American operations will not. As mentioned above, the bill's reach extends well beyond the gaming industry. Tribes are engaged in a variety of commercial enterprises, from mining and energy development, to manufacturing and construction. Over time, it is reasonable to expect that tribal enterprises will expand and compete more aggressively with non-Native companies in a wide variety of commercial sectors, without any concern for the rights of workers.

Tribal labor law is woefully inadequate—virtually non-existent in most tribes around the country. It is no replacement for the nation's basic legal framework that protects workers' rights. Eliminating the NLRA for tribal enterprises will strip away freedoms guaranteed to Americans today, including hundreds of thousands of workers at tribal casinos who are not Native American. S. 140 (115–54) would immediately eliminate the rights of thousands of Operating Engineers in workplaces all over the United States.

The International Union of Operating Engineers opposes S. 140 (115–54), which eliminates nearly one-million workers' individual right to take collective action to improve their working conditions, and respectfully urges you to oppose it when it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives on Wednesday.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA—UAW,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than one million active and retired members of the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), I urge you to vote against S. 140, because it includes provisions from the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 986). This misguided bill would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to hundreds of thousands of workers employed by tribal casinos. This legislation could also impact dozens of other businesses, including power plants, mining operations, and hotels.

UAW believes strongly in tribal sovereignty and has a strong record of supporting civil rights. This bill, however, is misleading. It is an attack on fundamental collective bargaining rights and would strip workers in commercial enterprises of their rights and protections under the NLRA. Under the terms of this bill, when a labor contract expires, a tribe could unilaterally terminate the bargaining relationship with the union without legal consequence under the NLRA, because the employer's obligation to bargain could be eliminated. As a result of having a union and a legally binding contract, hundreds of dealers have been promoted to benefited and supervisory positions because of provisions in the contract that maintain minimum percentages of full-time, part-time, and supervisory positions. Work rules, wages, and benefits have all improved because of the right to collectively bargain. This bill would jeopardize these hard-fought gains.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act seeks to overturn a decision by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) in San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2004). In that decision, the Board concluded that applying the NLRA would not interfere with the tribe's autonomy and the effects of the NLRA would not ''extend beyond the tribe's business enterprise and regulate intramural matters.'' The ruling does not apply in instances where its application would ''touch exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters'' or ''abrogate Indian treaty rights.'' The NLRB has taken a nuanced view on this matter and has ruled on a case-by-case basis. Congressional interference is not justified.

Supporters of the bill argue that the bill creates parity for the tribes with state and local governments who are not covered under the NLRA. However, there are some significant differences. Tribes are exempt from employment laws (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act) that apply to state and local governments, whereas private sector contractors work extensively on behalf of state and local governments and generally must comply with the NLRA. Non-tribal members cannot petition a tribe for labor legislation, while workers employed by a state or local government have a voice with their elected leaders. This is significant because 75 percent of Native American gaming employees are not tribal members. At Foxwoods, where the UAW represents the workers, well over 98 percent of employees and patrons are not tribal members. Hundreds of tribal gaming facilities make tens of billions in revenue annually, and these employees are working for what is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

At a time of growing wealth inequality and a shrinking middle class, the last thing Congress should do is deprive workers of their legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively. We urge you to oppose S. 140.

Sincerely,

JOSH NASSAR,
Legislative Director.

UFCW,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2018.

To All Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.3 million members of United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW), I am writing to express our strong opposition to the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act as rolled into a bill that will be reported as S. 140.

UFCW is proud to represent 1,000 members at casinos that operate on tribal lands. These workers have joined together to bargain collectively for good wages, decent benefits, and a voice on the job. Passage of the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act would take that voice away.

We support sovereignty for tribal governments, but the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act is so broad that it would prevent any worker from exercising their freedom of association under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). The vast majority tribal casino workers are not tribal members and therefore have no voice in tribal policy and are not protected under tribal law.

Most federal laws protecting the workplace apply to tribal businesses including the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), and NLRA. The NLRA should not be treated any differently than these other important laws that protect workers.

There are many differences between state and local governments and tribal businesses. State and local governments do not operate multi-billion dollar commercial Enterprises, nor manage enterprises where the majority of the employees and customers are from outside of the jurisdiction. If working people don't like state and local government policy

they can change management by voting for different lawmakers, while non-tribal employees and customers have no meaningful way to influence tribal policy.

Congress should be working to expand the rights of American workers, not take them away. We urge you to stand up for American workers and oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. PERRONE,
International President.

UNITE HERE!,
Las Vegas, NV

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: UNITE HERE represents over 275,000 hardworking men and women in the hospitality industry and strongly urges you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 986).

Like most Americans, our members have a deep respect for Native Americans and their role in shaping our nation. Our members also have a deep and abiding respect for the rights of American workers and to uphold the laws that govern our nation and all of its citizens.

This brings me to H.R. 986. This bill would exempt all businesses owned and operated by Indian nations from the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Tribal businesses, including but not limited to Indian-owned casinos, have workforces and customers that are almost all non-Indian. If this bill were to become law, American citizens working for Native American businesses would lose their U.S. rights under the NLRA, including ''full freedom of association'' and ''self-organization'' without ''discrimination.'' Over the last 30 years, as Indian enterprises entered the stream of interstate commerce, a number of federal laws protecting the workplace have been applied to Indian businesses: Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), and National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Congress should not treat the rights Americans have under the NLRA any differently than these other important laws that protect American workers.

Much has been made of the need for this bill to give tribal governments ''parity'' with state and local governments. This comparison is misleading, if not absurd. States and local governments do not typically operate multi-billion dollar commercial enterprises. States and local governments do not typically run enterprises where the overwhelming majority of the government's employees are from outside of their jurisdiction and the overwhelming majority of customers are also from outside of their jurisdiction. In a state or locality, if the citizens who live there don't like the government's policies, they can vote for people to change those policies. The non-tribal employees and customers have no meaningful way to influence tribal policies.

In this time of incredible income inequality in our country, Congress should be working to expand the rights of American workers, not finding ways to take them away. H.R. 986 is no different than the laws signed by Governors Scott Walker (R-WI) and Rick Snyder (R-MI): they attack the basic rights of workers to organize and collectively bargain.

Please stand up for American workers and join our union to oppose H.R. 986.

Sincerely,

D. TAYLOR.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact of those in opposition, but 150 Tribes and individuals from the Native Americans that are asking for this stand in support of this, and we are delighted to listen to that and work for a solution here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

□ 1715

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the adoption of the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, an important and long overdue provision included in this legislation before us today.

For nearly 70 years, the National Labor Relations Board respected the sovereignty of Native American Tribes throughout the country and allowed the Tribes to adjudicate labor issues within the laws and standards of each Tribe. However, in 2004, the NLRB began to change its longstanding practices and adopted subjective tests to determine when it wanted to assert its jurisdiction in matters involving Native American Tribes.

These subjective tests are applied on an arbitrary, case-by-case basis and are having an impact on Tribal businesses that are operated on sovereign Tribal lands. Tribal business leaders have been asking Congress to respect their sovereign rights and end the NLRB's inconsistent and misguided decisions when it comes to labor decisions dealing with Tribal businesses.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, sponsored by Representative TODD ROKITA, a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, stops the NLRB from picking winners and losers when it comes to matters dealing with Tribal businesses and ends the bureaucratic overreach conducted by the NLRB in recent years.

Most importantly, this legislation protects the sovereignty Native Americans deserve and ensures that Tribes have control over their own labor relations and, ultimately, determine what works best for workplaces on Tribal lands.

Bipartisan support for Tribal sovereignty has been reaffirmed time and again by Congress, and for more than 180 years, the Supreme Court has held that Tribes possess a nationhood status and retain inherent powers of self-government. It is time that we strip unelected bureaucrats of the power they abuse and respect the rights of Native American Tribes.

I wish to thank Representative TODD ROKITA for introducing and championing the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act and urge Members to support this important clarification to Federal law.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will you advise as to how much time is left on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Virginia has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

It was in 1935 that this body enacted the National Labor Relations Act. It guaranteed basic rights to private sector workers to organize into trade unions, to engage in contractual bargaining for decent wages and better conditions at work, and to take joint action, if necessary.

But in 1935, just like today, here, 2018, the Republican Party and business interests vehemently opposed passage of any laws that help workers. Little has changed. Once again our Republican colleagues trample on the backs of workers.

This legislation rolls back proven protections that allow wages to rise in places like California, and their casinos, from $10 an hour to $13 an hour. Now, these modest pay increases have helped elevate the workers who work in those casinos above the Federal poverty level.

Who has ever tried to buy a house in California or tried to live on $13 an hour or $10 an hour? You are not talking about a whole lot of money there, especially from a party that just gave $1 trillion away to the people at the very top.

But with this bill, our Republican colleagues chose to strip these hundreds of thousands of workers, the majority of whom are not members of Tribes but work in those casinos, of decent wages and their right to a voice in the workplace.

Wow.

Beneath their sheepskin costumes hides another Republican attack on worker rights in this country, this time under the guise of Tribal sovereignty.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentlewoman from Ohio an additional 1 minute.

Ms. KAPTUR. Let me remind my colleagues though, throughout our National Labor Relations Board's history, it has never and will not assert jurisdiction where it would interfere with a Tribe's internal governance rights in purely intramural matters.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this bad bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the strong opposition to it from the United Steelworkers of America and from the Communications Workers of America. As a proud daughter of labor, I am proud to stand here today in opposition to this bill.

UNITED STEELWORKERS,
Pittsburgh, PA, January 9, 2018.

Re United Steelworkers oppose inclusion of anti-worker H.R. 986, Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2017 in S. 140.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 850,000 members of the United Steelworkers (USW), we strongly urge you to oppose S. 140 on the House floor this week. Rather than

being identical to the Senate bill, this version includes the anti-worker and undemocratic Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2017 (H.R. 986).

H.R. 986 would exempt all employees of federally recognized Native American-owned commercial enterprises operated on Indian lands from the protections of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and would authorize over 567 distinct and separate labor law jurisdictions in the United States.

To be absolutely clear, this legislation strips workers—both Native American and non-Native American—of their NLRA protections. While some organizations have falsely attempted to paint tribal governments as similar entities to states (which are exempt from the NLRA), tribal governments are substantially different than states in one key democratic principal: state governments allow workers an ability to vote for their legislators no matter their ancestry, while most tribal governments require blood quantum or lineal descent to determine who is eligible for membership or citizenship.

Simply put, if H.R. 986 becomes law by inclusion in S. 140, U.S. citizens working in the United States for tribal commercial enterprises would not be able to vote for the elected representatives who set their labor laws. These workers will lose the ability to petition the government that oversees their working conditions.

The gaming industry, which is an employer for approximately 246 of the 567 federally recognized American Indian tribes; has over 600,000 casino workers on tribal lands, the overwhelming majority of whom are not Native Americans. In 2011 before the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, the National Indian Gaming Commission testified that the vast majority of employees (up to 75 percent) were non-tribal members.

Our union understands the importance of the principle of tribal sovereignty; however the fundamental human rights of employees are not the exclusive concern of tribal enterprises or tribal governments. As the International Labor Organization highlighted in a letter on a previous version of this bill, ''it is critical that the State (the national authority) takes ultimate responsibility for ensuring respect for freedom of association and collective bargaining rights throughout its territory''. That is why we believe the current test set by the NLRB is the best course of action until labor laws are strengthened in the United States.

In 2004, the NLRB under the Bush Administration ruled for the first time that Tribal casino workers should have the benefit of NLRA protections, San Manuel, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2204). Yet, since the San Manuel ruling, the NLRB has asserted jurisdiction on a case-by-case basis. In 2015, the NLRB declined jurisdiction citing the 1830 Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek and 1866 Treaty of Washington stating:

''We have no doubt that asserting jurisdiction over the Casino and the Nation would effectuate the policies of the Act. However, because we find that asserting jurisdiction would abrogate treaty rights specific to the Nation.'' Chickasaw Nation Windstar World Casino, 362 NLRB 109 92015).

Similarly the NLRB declined jurisdiction:

''. . . when an Indian tribe is fulfilling a traditionally tribal or governmental function that is unique to its status, fulfilling just such a unique governmental function [providing free health care services solely to tribal members],'' Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation, 341 NLRB 139 (2004).

The NLRB has developed a reasonable and responsible test to determine jurisdiction. H.R. 986 creates significant confusion and jurisdictional issues over labor law enforcement and grossly undermines worker's rights. Our union urges you to oppose S. 140, with the inclusion of H.R. 986, and asks you to instead work to expand worker's rights not restrict them further.

Sincerely,

LEO W. GERARD,
International President.

JANUARY 9, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members and officers of the Communications Workers of America (CWA), I am writing to express our strong opposition to S. 140. CWA has no objections whatsoever to Sections 1 and 2 of the bill as amended. Unfortunately, these non-controversial, sensible bills have been hijacked to also pass H.R. 986, a bill that would strip hundreds of thousands of workers at tribal-owned and -operated enterprises of their protections for the right to bargain collectively.

H.R. 986 seeks to overturn a National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) decision in San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, which applied the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to a tribal casino enterprise. The NLRB's finding in San Manuel adopted a test to determine whether the NLRA is applicable to businesses operating on tribal lands—if it would ''touch exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters'' or ''abrogate Indian treaty rights,'' the NLRA would not apply, but otherwise the decision will be based on a series of factors including whether an entity is a purely commercial enterprise or employs or caters to individuals who are not tribal members.

The San Manuel test balances two crucial issues—tribal sovereignty and the right of workers to bargain collectively. The test ensures that truly internal matters of self-governance will continue to be handled by sovereign tribes, while also ensuring that the fundamental rights of workers to organize and advocate for their own interests are properly respected. H.R. 986 would overturn this balance by exempting any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian tribe and located on its land from the requirements of the NLRA—or any other guarantee of workers' fundamental right to organize and collectively bargain.

The practical impact of H.R. 986 would be to exempt a broad swath of businesses from the NLRA, even though, in many cases, they are purely commercial enterprises. For many of these companies—particularly casinos—the majority of their workforces are not members of the tribe employing them and therefore do not have full access to internal, tribal mechanisms for grieving issues or petitioning for change in tribal policies. This is why the International Labour Organization stated in 2015 that ''it would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the NLRA and its mechanisms would give rise to a failure to ensure these workers their fundamental freedom of association rights.''

I urge you to oppose S. 140 as amended and instead work to advance an agenda that protects both workers' fundamental human right to organize and tribal sovereignty. CWA will consider including votes on this bill in our Congressional Scorecard Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

SHANE LARSON,
Legislative Director,
Communications Workers of America (CWA).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) for introducing this very important legislation that restores a simple promise: the sovereign rights of Native Americans will be protected.

For almost 70 years following the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, Tribal sovereignty was upheld and Tribes were given the equal right to self-governance enjoyed by our State and local governments. For the Tribes in my district, sovereignty meant the freedom to advance their own economic development and provide critical government services to their Tribal members.

With the NLRB's San Manuel decision, unelected bureaucrats tossed aside this longstanding precedent and began to assert themselves in Tribal matters on an arbitrary, case-by-case basis. The agency granted itself the right to navigate Tribal law and decide when a Tribal enterprise is for commercial purposes, a requirement that would never be imposed on revenue-generating activities of State and local governments.

As the Federal bureaucracy expands its own power, Tribes face legal confusion and uncertainty, hindering their self-sufficiency and the ability to provide for their members.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act restores the well-established legal standard of Tribal sovereignty. As State and local governments are excluded from the Federal requirements of the NLRA, this bill simply ensures Tribal governments receive equal treatment, not lesser status. It provides our Tribes with needed clarity that, when an enterprise is owned and operated by the Indian Tribe and located on Tribal land, Tribal sovereignty will be protected.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation, and I am glad it was included in this package, which I urge my colleagues to support.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, what a sad state of affairs. There are scores of critically important issues that need to be considered by this House, not the least of which is funding our government. We failed to do that, and now we are confronted with a bill that is recycled, and we have added two natural resources bills on it that could have passed unanimously.

I am a big defender of Native Tribes' rights and sovereignty, and I know that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle remain committed to their sovereignty as well. This bill, however, is about undermining the National Labor Relations Act, not about Tribal sovereignty.

That act, the National Labor Relations Act, safeguards workers' rights to organize and bargain collectively. Most of my friends on the other side of the aisle are not for that. I know that. I have seen them vote that way.

No matter where you work, the basic protections for American workers, however, ought to apply. It is already

settled law that the National Labor Relations Act and other worker protection laws apply to businesses even on Tribal lands outside the context of inherently governmental functions carried out by Tribal governments. This was not decided by some faceless bureaucrat. This was a court of our land that made this decision.

Instead of undermining workers' rights, this House ought to be moving forward with policies that help our workers and their families make it in America as part of a strong middle class. That means raising wages. It means making childcare more affordable. It means expanding access to opportunities like higher education, homeownership, and a secure retirement. Those are the issues that Democrats continue to be focused on.

That is not what this bill focuses on. Instead, Republicans are focused not on helping workers, but trying to pit one group, Tribes, against another group, workers. That is not what we ought to have in this country.

And they are attaching popular, noncontroversial natural resources bills to this legislation. They have nothing to do with this legislation and would pass overwhelmingly.

I am going to vote against this bill, and I hope they will bring the natural resources bills back so we can pass those, as everybody wants to do.

This is not the kind of regular order Speaker RYAN promised when he took the gavel and that Republicans promised when they took the majority.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. As I said at the beginning, we are bringing this bill to the floor, a retread. This is not new legislation that they are offering. The only thing new about it is they put two natural resources bills attached to it.

We should be focused, as I said before, on reaching agreement on appropriation bills, on caps, on protecting DREAMers, on making sure that CHIP children aren't left aside, not this bill. But those bills aren't scheduled today, and they are not scheduled next week as far as I know. Maybe the majority leader will give me better information tomorrow.

In fact, what we really ought to be working on now, as I say, are those appropriation bills. But, under the Republican majority, we are still stuck working on fiscal year 2018 when we are already nearly halfway through.

I urge my colleagues not to oppose Tribal sovereignty, not to oppose the rights of our Native American brothers and sisters. We are for them, but not to be pitted against workers making a decent, acceptable wage so they can live with some quality of life.

It is not enough to give the upper 1 percent a huge tax cut and pretend that you are helping the middle class, the workers. In fact, in this bill, you are doing exactly the opposite.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and stand up for workers, whether they are Native Americans or whoever they may be. Stand up for workers. Respect workers. Understand that workers made this country great, and they deserve our support and our protection.

Defeat this bill.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a gentleman who had a distinguished record of supporting and helping and enabling workers.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 140 and its inclusion of H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act.

There are more than 560 federally recognized Native American Tribes across the United States, and each of these Tribes has a unique history and distinct culture that have helped shape who we are today as a nation. Each Tribe has an inherent right to self-govern, just like any other sovereign government does.

That right to self-governance is rooted in the Constitution and has been reaffirmed by courts for almost 200 years. Because of it, Tribal leaders are able to make decisions that affect their people in a way that makes the most sense for their Tribe and best protects the interests of their members—or, rather, they should be able to make those decisions.

We are here today because, for the past 14 years, the National Labor Relations Board has ignored longstanding labor policy and involved itself in Tribal activities. Since its 2004 San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino decision, the Board has used a subjective test to decide on a case-by-case basis whether a Tribal business or Tribal land is for commercial purposes, and, if it is, the Board has asserted its jurisdiction over that business.

□ 1730

Among its other provisions, the bill under consideration would amend the National Labor Relations Act to reaffirm that the NLRB cannot assert its authority over enterprises or institutions owned or operated by a Tribe on Tribal land. It very simply reasserts a legal standard that was in place for decades and returns to Tribes the ability to manage their own labor relations as a sovereign right has.

I want to thank my friend and fellow member of the Education and the Workforce Committee from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) for his leadership on this issue and for continuing to work on those in Congress who have helped lead the fight to protect Tribal sovereignty over the years.

It is time for all of us to join that fight and stand with the Native American community and restore to Indian Tribes the ability to govern their own labor relations.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how you support Tribal sovereignty, which, by definition, is a sovereign state, but not allow Tribes to self-govern. I don't understand that, and I also don't understand, Mr. Speaker, if our friends on the other side of the aisle today are so worried about getting our work done, why I had to leave committee hearings to come over here three times today to vote not adjourning this body. I would like to know that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, the land of opportunity is right here. It is called the United States of America. But, unfortunately, there is not always a level playing field when it comes to that land of opportunity. This year is the 83rd anniversary of the National Labor Relations Act, the act that gave workers a voice, a voice in the workplace. It gave them the ability to bargain—along with their employers—a living wage, pensions, the ability to retire with dignity.

But today, we are really debating how to hurt workers—that somehow you get treated outside of the reservations in a humane way, where casinos are operating in a very profitable way, but you cross that line, and you are being treated differently. You are being treated less than and doing it all under the guise of Native American sovereignty.

The vast majority of casinos on their properties are treated with respect by employees. But they were able to get to some folks to introduce this piece that somehow let them try to do it differently on that line. When we cross it, you are less than. We can take advantage of you, and we see that happen time after time.

I have been before the NLRB many times, had cases. I won many, but I also lost them. But I always felt as if I was treated fairly. And that is what we should be doing here, treating employees, no matter where you are in this great country, fairly. It has been a decade since we raised the minimum wage. And somehow, we are just looking for no reason to hurt employees.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, we want to respect the sovereign nations, but we can't pick and choose the way we treat them. Certainly, everybody who works in this great country deserves an opportunity to be treated fairly.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Transport Workers Union of America that talks about being fairly treated.

TRANSPORT WORKDERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO,

January 10, 2018.

VOTE ALERT: VOTE NO ON THE TRIBAL LABOR SOVEREIGNTY ACT (S. 140)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Transport Workers Union of America (TWU), AFL-CIO, we write urging you to oppose the

Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. This bill (introduced as H.R. 986) has been paired with unrelated bills and packaged as part of S. 140, which the House is expected to vote on today. We urge you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act by voting NO on S. 140.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act would exempt from the protections of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) workers employed by tribal-owned and -operated commercial enterprises located on tribal lands. Under this bill, the NLRA rights and protections would be denied to more than 600,000 tribal casino workers, the vast majority of whom are not Native American.

This bill would overturn a 2004 decision by the Bush Administration's National Labor Relations Board (Board), in which the Board applied the NLRA to a tribal casino (San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2004)). In reaching this decision, the Board applied a test: the NLRA will not apply if its application would ''touch exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters.'' And, the NLRA will not apply if it would ''abrogate Indian treaty rights.'' The Board also considered other factors, including that the casino in question was a typical commercial enterprise that catered to non-Native American customers and employed non-Native Americans. While the Board asserted NLRA protections in the San Manuel decision, it ruled the opposite way, denying its jurisdiction in a companion case (Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation, 341 NLRB No. 139 (2004)).

We understand the importance of tribal sovereignty and support the principle in true self-governance matters. But the fundamental human rights of employees are not the exclusive concern of tribal enterprises or tribal governments. While proponents of the bill falsely compare tribal governments to state governments, they miss a glaring truth: while state governments are exempt from NLRA protections, their workers are eligible to vote for those who set their labor laws. But the vast majority of the 600,000 casino workers who would be impacted by the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act are not Native Americans, and therefore have no voice in the selection of those setting tribal policy nor the ability to petition the tribal government to protect their rights.

We object to a sweeping exemption of all tribal enterprises from the NLRA, and believe the test used by the Board to determine whether the NLRA is applicable should remain. Unfortunately, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act has been packaged with unrelated bills in an attempt to pressure support for this particular bill. While TWU has no position on the other bills contained in S. 140, we urge you vote NO in opposition to the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to really look inside yourself. Is this the best way to treat employees? Is this how we help lift up all of those workers? I think not, and I urge Members to reject this attempt to hurt workers and not protect sovereignty.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of yielding 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the sponsor of this legislation, as well as the chair of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I rise in strong support of this bill which includes a provision identical to the legislation that I have been cosponsoring the last two Congresses, H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. I also want to thank all of the Members who came in support of this legislation here today and last Congress from this side of the aisle who stood up for the rights of sovereign nations, our friends, Native Americans, and who made very clear the issue before us today.

It was mentioned by the naysayers on the other side of the aisle that the NLRA, the National Labor Relations Act, started in 1935. If you go back to that legislation—and it still exists today in the same form—you see that Federal, State, and local governments are exempted from the act for good reason.

This was supposed to always be a private sector labor relations act and bill. Now, we can argue the pros and cons of that all day long, but that is not the debate here today. The fact of the matter is that governments were specifically exempted.

Mr. Speaker, why does that not include our Native American friends who have sovereign nations? You know, I took my two boys—Kathy and I took my two boys, Ryan and Teddy, to a water park this year and last year—two different cities in my district. Those cities operated the water park. They owned it. We paid the fee. We went in. We used it.

The employees who worked there—and they were excellent—were exempt from the NLRA. Yet the Democrats who pander to groups left and right are now saying that they are for the sovereign rights of the government, of our Native American Tribes, but they say this isn't that bill. No, it is. It is that simple.

You are either for their sovereignty, Mr. Speaker, or you are not. And that is all this bill does. It doesn't choose between friends. The Democrats do not need to worry. It is either you are for people in believing in their own destiny and manifesting it, or you think that you have to subject them to your will. That is all this bill is about.

By the way, I think it is absolutely ridiculous—Dr. ROE asked the question. I won't ask the question. I will put it in statement form. I think it is absolutely ridiculous that some Members, Mr. Speaker, can come to the floor of the House today and say that this is not an important bill, that the rights of the governments of sovereign nations aren't important, and that there are other things to do.

Yet, three times today, the Democrats motioned to adjourn the House, wasting precious legislative time. This bill is supported by more than 150 Tribes. The chamber of commerce supports the bill. Four Democrats cosponsor the bill, and I thank each of them for it. Last Congress, the bill passed the House with bipartisan support. And, Mr. Speaker, I suspect it will again today.

Let's get this job done. Let's support our Native American friends. Let's support the sovereignty of the governments at the Federal, State, and local level. Support this bill, especially subsection 3.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter in opposition to the bill from the AFL–CIO.

AFL–CIO LEGISLATIVE ALERT

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, January 9, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The AFL-CIO urges you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, H.R. 986, which would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to a large number of workers employed by tribal-owned and -operated enterprises located on Indian land. Among these workers are over 600,000 tribal casino workers, the vast majority of whom are not Native Americans. In recent years, the number and type of enterprises affected has grown well beyond the gaming industry, and would now include mining operations, power plants, smoke shops, saw mills, construction companies, ski resorts, high-tech firms, hotels, and spas. Many of these are commercial businesses that compete with non-Indian enterprises. As proposed, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act would strip all workers in these enterprises of their rights and protections under the NLRA.

The House bill, introduced by Representative Rokita, would overturn a decision by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) in San Manuel Indian Bingo & Casino, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2004), which applied the NLRA to a tribal casino enterprise. In San Manuel, the NLRB looked to Supreme Court and circuit court precedent to articulate a test for whether the NLRB should assert jurisdiction over tribal enterprises, whether located on tribal lands or outside them. (Before San Manuel, NLRB jurisdiction was determined based solely on location: On tribal land, the NLRB would forego jurisdiction; off tribal land, the NLRB would assert jurisdiction. Under the San Manuel test, the NLRA will not apply if its application would ''touch exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters.'' Nor will the NLRA apply if it would ''abrogate Indian treaty rights.'' The Board in San Manuel also considered other factors, including whether the casino in question was a typical commercial enterprise, employed non-Native Americans, and catered to non-Native American customers.

In San Manuel, the Board concluded that applying the NLRA would not interfere with the tribe's autonomy, and the effects of the NLRA would not ''extend beyond the tribe's business enterprise and regulate intramural matters.'' However, the test articulated in San Manuel provides a careful balancing of tribal sovereignty interests with the NLRA's federal labor law protections. In a companion case, Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corp., 341 NLRB No. 139 (2004), the Board tipped the balance the other way and didn't assert jurisdiction.

The AFL-CIO supports the principle of sovereignty for tribal governments, but does not believe that employers should use this principle to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. While the AFL-CIO continues to support the concept of tribal sovereignty in truly internal, self-governance matters, it is in no position to repudiate fundamental human rights that belong to every worker in every nation. Workers cannot be left without any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively in instances where they are

working for a tribal enterprise which is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

The International Labour Organization (ILO), an agency of the United Nations, has confirmed this view in response to a question about whether excluding (from the NLRA) workers employed on tribal lands would conform with principles of freedom of association. These values are at the core of the ILO Constitution and the ILO's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. The Director for the International Labour Standards Division wrote that in the absence of tribal ordinances offering full protection of internationally recognized rights, ''it is critical that the State (the national authority) takes ultimate responsibility for ensuring respect for freedom of association and collective bargaining rights throughout its territory.'' In other words, if the tribes themselves don't guarantee these basic rights—and many do not, the U.S. government must not abdicate its responsibility to protect them.

Notwithstanding the importance of the principle of tribal sovereignty, the fundamental human rights of employees are not the exclusive concern of tribal enterprises or tribal governments. In fact, the vast majority of employees of these commercial enterprises, such as casinos, are not Native Americans. They therefore have no voice in setting tribal policy and no recourse to tribal governments for the protection of their rights.

The AFL-CIO opposes any effort to exempt on an across-the-board basis all tribal enterprises from the NLRA, without undertaking a specific review of all the circumstances—as current NLRB standards provide. Where the enterprise employs mainly Native American employees with mainly Native American customers, and involves self-governance or intramural affairs, leaving the matter to tribal governments may be appropriate. However, where the business employs primarily non-Native American employees and caters to primarily non-Native American customers, there is no basis for depriving employees of their rights and protections under the National Labor Relations Act.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL, *Director, Government Affairs Department.*

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about State and local being exempt and Tribes not being exempt. Well, that was a decision made way back when. The law specifically exempts State and local. Maybe it should; maybe it didn't; but it did. Tribes were not specifically exempted.

So in conclusion, this bill will strip hundreds of thousands of employees of the right to join a union. Where some Tribes have Tribal labor ordinances that are fair and workable, others do not. And at least one expressly prohibits the formation of unions.

There is no principal basis for excluding these workers from coverage under labor law just because they happen to work in a commercial enterprise on Tribal lands. If this bill will come into law, it will be the first rollback of workers' rights under Federal law in over 70 years, and it may well place the United States in violation of several international trade agreements.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this has been a telling debate. Again, I think the key question here, as has been asked by so many colleagues: Are Native American Tribes government entities; are they sovereign? The only answer that we can respond with is: Absolutely, yes. They are sovereign. This is not an issue debating NLRB or NLRA. It is going back to what we have established already that, in fact, a sovereign nation, just like a State or local government, is free from the intervention of NLRB.

In this case, a sovereign nation has that right. Just as a reminder, over 150 Native American organizations have asked for this legislative effort to be achieved. Why? Because it was working fine up until 2004, and NLRB then came arbitrarily in—sometimes yes, sometimes not—intervening, but, ultimately, they were changing the system in place.

While we are moving back to letting the sovereignty reign in these Native American Tribes, yet we need to make it very clear for the future and not go back to what has precipitated this change.

The bill amends the National Labor Relations Act to clarify that the law does not apply to any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian Tribe and located on Tribal land. It protects the sovereignty of Native American Tribes, reaffirming they are afforded the same rights and protections enjoyed by State and local government.

It ensures Tribes have control over their labor relations and can determine what is best for the workplaces. It eliminates legal confusion and uncertainty that is hindering the ability of Tribal governments to serve their citizens.

Mr. Speaker, that is what it does. It reasserts and reaffirms what we have already said in law. And for that reason, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 681, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be 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. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of S. 140 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4567; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

AYES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—173

Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)

Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Demings
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch

NOT VOTING—19

Adams
Brooks (IN)
Carbajal
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Gabbard
Gaetz
Hanabusa
Jenkins (WV)
Kind
McHenry
McNerney
Nolan
Scalise
Scott, David
Shuster
Turner
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1809

Messrs. CROWLEY, KATKO, and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. HECK, BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and ZELDIN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS OVERSEAS PERSONNEL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4567) to require a Department of Homeland Security overseas personnel enhancement plan, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—415

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
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
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—16

Adams
Carbajal
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Gabbard
Gaetz
Hanabusa
Jenkins (WV)
Kind
McHenry
McNerney
Nolan
Scalise
Shuster
Turner
Wilson (FL)

□ 1816

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays

178, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—231

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Engel
Estes (KS)
Evans
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Higgins (LA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Huffman
Hultgren
Issa
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Panetta
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Quigley
Reichert
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ross
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Takano
Taylor
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IA)

NAYS—178

Amash
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blum
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Burgess
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Doyle, Michael F.
Emmer
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Farenthold
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxx
Fudge
Gallagher
Gallego
Gohmert
Gomez
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Khanna
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
LaHood
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
McGovern
McKinley
McSally
Mitchell
Neal
Norcross
O'Halleran
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Soto
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Torres
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Zeldin

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—21

Adams
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cummings
DeSaulnier
Gabbard
Gaetz
Goodlatte
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Jenkins (WV)
Kind
McHenry
McNerney
Nolan
Pelosi
Rush
Scalise
Shuster
Turner
Wilson (FL)

□ 1823

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HONORING JERRY RUELF

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Mr. Jerry Ruelf, an American hero from Ocala, Florida, who passed away this year on January 7.

At the age of 17, Mr. Ruelf joined the 101st Airborne Division during World War II and received many decorations for his courageous actions overseas, among which are the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Purple Heart. I had the distinct honor several years ago to present him with a collection of medals, which required him to get a larger jacket.

Following the end of the war, Mr. Ruelf continued to serve the American people as a teacher at Dixie Hollins High School in St. Petersburg, Florida, where he led the school's swim team through an undefeated season in 1971. Mr. Ruelf is honored in the Swimming Hall of Fame for his accomplishments at both Boca Ciega High School and Dixie Hollins High School in Florida.

Mr. Ruelf was an outstanding patriot, and he will be dearly missed by all in his community. His example of leadership through service is one we can all learn from.

To Mr. Ruelf, along with the others from that Greatest Generation era, I thank you, my family thanks you, and our Nation thanks you for the life you lived, for your service to your country, community, and for making this world a better place.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN ROBERT WEYGAND

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great Rhode Island public servant, educator, and dear friend, my predecessor, Congressman Robert Weygand.

During his time in government, Bob served as a Rhode Island State legislator from 1985 to 1993, Lieutenant Governor from 1993 to 1997, and United States Representative for the Second Congressional District of Rhode Island from 1997 to 2001.

Bob has always fought passionately for the people of the State of Rhode Island, and in the decades since, he has shared his wealth of knowledge with the students at the University of Rhode Island, dedicating himself to preparing the next generation of leaders.

As he retires from that position, I want to say that Bob served for the right reasons: to make a positive difference in his community and improve the lives of the people around him.

I am proud to call him my predecessor in the Halls of Congress, my dear friend and mentor to this day, and I happily congratulate him on his retirement from URI.

I know that, in one way or another, Bob will continue to serve his community as he always has: with integrity, passion, and wisdom.

HONORING OFFICERS COREY HELMS AND DYLAN COLE

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Officers Corey Helms and Dylan Cole of the Monroe, North Carolina, Police Department, who, on December 26, risked their lives to save two families trapped in a burning home.

Officer Helms was first to arrive but was pushed back by the thick cloud of smoke. Officer Cole arrived next, and together, the two men attempted to

find a ladder to rescue the five people trapped on the second floor. Unable to find a ladder, Monroe's two heroes disregarded their own safety by charging into the burning home and up the stairs before carrying and guiding the young families to safety.

Officers Cole and Helms rescued two adult sisters and their children, ages 3 years, 10 months, and 5 months. There were no injuries as a result.

Officers Corey Helms and Dylan Cole are living examples of what it means to serve and to protect. Please join me in honoring these two brave officers and all the men and women of the Monroe Police Department who work on our behalf every day. God bless them.

□ 1830

DACA

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, Congress must stop deferring the American Dream for bright young people simply because they were brought here as children.

DACA recipients represent the best of our Nation. These are young people who are in school, got their education, or served in our Armed Forces. These are people who never committed a felony offense or significant misdemeanor. These are people who pose no threat to public safety. These are people who just want to live the American Dream, and each day that passes without Congress voting on the Dream Act darkens their futures.

Mr. Speaker, if it is numbers my esteemed colleagues on the other side of the aisle want, I have got them. Deporting DACA recipients would cost the U.S. economy $400 billion. Deporting the 5,300 eligible people for DACA in my district alone would cost the economy $140 million.

Aren't we supposed to be growing the economy, not shrinking it?

CONGRATULATING MUGSHOTS GRILL & BAR ON THEIR 14TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ron Savell and the entire Mugshots Grill & Bar staff on 14 years of successful business.

On January 10, 2004, the first Mugshots Grill & Bar was opened in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, near the campus of my alma mater, the University of Southern Mississippi. While the original, unfortunately, burned down in 2011, there are now more than 18 restaurant locations spanning three States.

Ron is a fellow USM Golden Eagle that continues to expand his businesses in south Mississippi. Most recently, he has opened Brewsky's in Hattiesburg and Patio 44 in Hattiesburg and Biloxi. His restaurants continue to fuel the economies of my district.

The success that Ron has had in such a short amount of time is a testament to his entrepreneurial spirit and his hard work, persistence, and determination. And, of course, he has a great partner: his wife, Caitlin, and their beautiful family.

Next time you are in south Mississippi, be sure to stop by Mugshots Grill & Bar and have yourself a delicious peanut butter burger.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Ron on his 14th anniversary.

DREAMERS DREAM OF THE GREATNESS OF AMERICA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, a little clarity I think is very important on a very, very important issue.

I would like to call 140,000 young people in my State DREAMers because they dream of the greatness of America. The status that they are under is something called DACA, which was instituted by President Barack Obama because this Republican Congress could not provide legislative relief, so he saw the lives that were being impacted. In a few months, however, the present President, who feigns not knowing what happened, was the individual who removed that DACA status.

So let me be very clear: it is a dire situation, and the reason is because there are individuals whose status is now expiring or has already expired, therefore, they are living in limbo. These are doctors, lawyers, teachers, and young people with families.

It is crucial that we move quickly for a DACA fix, and we do it without impacting family reunification or diversity visas. We do it out of humanity, caring, and respect. Let's do it now. Let's do it for America.

RECOGNIZING TOM BARTON

(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 recognize the longtime editorial page editor of the Savannah Morning News, Mr. Tom Barton, who officially retired on January 5, after 39 years of service.

He began his time in Savannah writing for the former Savannah Evening Press covering crime and police stories. His first stories included a murder trial of an elderly woman and a man who violated city code by killing a chicken and leaving its remnants on city sidewalks.

These stories quickly taught Mr. Barton lessons in journalism while his gripping, clear, and insightful writing helped him become an influential and trusted writer and editor in Savannah.

Since those first stories, he has covered the most important topics in Savannah over the past decades, including interviews with the infamous Jim Williams, photos of running back Herschel Walker, and stories about political elections.

Mr. Barton not only knows the unique character of Savannah better than anyone in our area, but he has also contributed greatly to its development over the last 39 years.

His regular contributions to the Savannah Morning News will be missed. I thank him for his dedication to making Savannah a better place to live.

OPPOSE OFFSHORE DRILLING

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Trump administration announced a proposal to open our Nation's Federal waters to potential oil and gas exploration.

Immediately, leaders and lawmakers from the West Coast to the East Coast, and Republicans and Democrats from the leftwing to the rightwing came out against such a proposal for offshore oil drilling.

Being from the central coast of California, I know how important our oceans and our coastlines are for our economy, our businesses, our communities, and our families. That is why we have long fought to protect our coast from drilling with zoning laws and limiting onshore oil infrastructure to the designation of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, and legislation to protect our oceans and coasts.

I believe that, in Congress, we will work to uphold those laws and legacy of protection and preservation, but the Trump administration needs to hear from you. So I ask my constituents and all Americans to share why they also oppose this proposal for oil drilling off our coast. Participate in the public comment period that is now open until March 9, for it is your opportunity to speak directly to the administration, to stand up for your community, and to protect our environment and our future.

WELCOME HOME, LONNIE EICHELBERGER

(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, the men and women who defend our country have one sacred creed: leave no one behind, and they all come home.

It took 72 years and 234 days, but today, at Houston's VA cemetery, Lonnie Eichelberger came home.

At 16, Lonnie left China Spring, Texas, to fight the Nazis and Adolph

Hitler in Germany in World War II. He was a Buffalo Soldier, the all-Black 92nd Division of our Army. He never returned to see his family.

His remains were found in Italy in 1945, but they could not be identified. So Lonnie, for 17 years, was known as ''Unknown X–193.''

In 2016, his remains were identified. At 11:15 a.m. this morning, Texas time, Lonnie was laid to eternal rest.

Welcome home, soldier.

SMEAR CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE AUTHORS OF THE INFAMOUS DOSSIER EXPOSING TRUMP'S RUSSIA CONNECTIONS

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, character assassination is Donald Trump's favorite trick when people make him look bad. This month, Trump and his allies have been desperately smearing the authors of the infamous dossier, which exposes disturbing facts about Trump's Russia connections. By attacking Chris Steele and Fusion GPS, they are trying to divert attention from the damning content of the dossier and also to impugn the FBI for launching its investigation.

Here is the problem: the dossier didn't start the FBI investigation. It was a Trump policy adviser, George Papadopoulos, boasting to an Australian diplomat that Russia had stolen emails to interfere in our election. That was 2 months before those stolen emails were put online, and that smacks of collusion.

Thankfully, our Australian allies shared this information with the FBI and the investigation began. The dossier came along and corroborated what the FBI had already heard.

There is another problem with this smear campaign: It wasn't just the FBI that took the dossier seriously. Senator JOHN MCCAIN deemed it credible enough to turn it over to the FBI.

This is a serious document, corroborated by a host of other evidence, and the truth is coming out, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASO). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it has only been a few weeks since Congress passed the historic tax reform bill, but I am afraid it has got to be very tough for the opponents and our friends across the aisle because, well, you have to wonder: At some point, don't they tire of being wrong so often?

You might recall some claim before we passed the bill that it would raise taxes on the middle class, yet a majority of Americans will now see a tax decrease. In fact, the average family of four in Minnesota's Second District, which I am proud to represent, will see a tax cut of $3,154.

Then they claim that reducing taxes on businesses would never benefit Americans, but employers have already responded by giving a combined total of $1 billion in bonuses and wage increases to their employees. That equates to over 1 million Americans and counting getting a bonus.

Finally, they said the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act would never jump-start economic growth. Well, now, after two quarters of well over 3 percent growth, approaching 4 percent, it is as if the opponents of the tax reform bill are left telling the American people: Are you going to believe me or your own eyes?

The fact of the matter is our opponents rely on hyperbole, but the facts speak for themselves.

FUNDING FOR CHIP

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today pleading with my colleagues that we must come together to support a long-term funding solution for the traditionally bipartisan Children's Health Insurance Program, commonly known as CHIP.

Mr. Speaker, there is a family in Chesapeake, a locality in my district, that demonstrates the dire challenges families across Virginia and this country face without CHIP.

CHIP serves as a lifeline for this family with four children, ages 8, 7, 4, and 2. Before this family had access to CHIP, these children did not have health insurance or well child visits with a doctor. The parents limited the 7- and 8-year-old children to indoor activities because they were afraid the children might break a bone or sustain a serous injury.

The mother also missed visits to the doctor's office for vital prenatal care because she was worried about doctor bills. The parents missed work and kept the children home during flu season because they could not afford a doctor's visit.

With CHIP, the mother and children all have health insurance, they are up to date on their wellness exams, and the children play outside again.

Mr. Speaker, for the health of my constituents and millions of other Americans, we must immediately come together for long-term funding for CHIP.

CONGRATULATING TEHAMA COUNTY FARM BUREAU

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Tehama County Farm Bureau in my district on their 100th annual meeting. This on the heels of their centennial of being in business in Tehama County.

They are headquartered in Red Bluff, California. They have been an organization very dedicated, obviously, to farming, ranching, and agriculture in all its forms in Tehama County and its neighboring counties as partners as well.

Just last month, it was actually recognized as the Midsize Farm Bureau of the Year, according to the California Farm Bureau Federation Annual Meeting.

The Farm Bureau is very important and very involved in the fiber of rural communities with ag production, farming, ranching, hay, and all those operations that make what agriculture needs go round, as well as the activities at the fair with the kids, and with their future. The Farm Bureau, indeed, is an important part of the future of agriculture and feeding people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, again, I congratulate Tehama County Farm Bureau's membership, board, and leadership for hanging in there and serving that group of people for 100 years.

□ 1845

NON-METRO AREA AGENCY ON AGING

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, New Mexico decimated its behavioral health system when it terminated nearly every behavioral health provider in the State.

In fact, thousands of New Mexicans did not have access to medicine, counselors, or treatment, increasing their risks of substance abuse, health issues, and homelessness.

Many New Mexicans suffered, were incarcerated, or died because of the State's negligence. Today, we are potentially seeing an even more catastrophic State-created crisis in the making.

Just a few weeks ago, the State announced it intended to cancel its contract with the Non-Metro Area Agency on Aging, which manages and oversees critical services like adult daycare, meal services, caregiving, transportation, and respite care for vulnerable seniors and their families.

Decimating the current system without public hearings, due process, or having a public plan to ensure the continuity of services will disrupt these lifesaving safety net programs that serve nearly 80,000 seniors; and these seniors are going to suffer because of this reckless and hasty decision.

I have written to HHS demanding that they immediately investigate the State's negligent behavior.

HUMAN RIGHTS FOR THE IRANIAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the dramatic struggle for freedom and human rights that we are witnessing in the country of Iran.

The oppressive, theocratic regime in Iran has a bloody track record of abuses and has long neglected its citizens' most basic rights and needs.

The Government of Iran has squandered the precious resources of its people by supporting proxy armies throughout the Middle East and wreaking havoc across the globe instead of providing for the basic needs of its citizens. Courageous Iranians are proving each day that they are no longer willing to accept the indignities and repression from the ruling elite.

It is tragic, but not shocking, to see the regime in Iran respond to the recent wave of protests with violence, cutting off communications, media, and, predictably, blaming the United States of America.

I am a cosponsor of H. Res. 676, a resolution passed by the House of Representatives yesterday in support of the rights of the people of Iran to express themselves freely, and condemning the oppressive Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests.

I stand with the brave Iranians who are facing down the violent and brutal regime for the sake of liberty.

OFFSHORING GOP TAX SCAM

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight another scam in the GOP tax giveaway just signed into law. President Trump promised in November: ''Factories will be pouring back into this county.''

Really?

The Republican tax scam taxes earnings of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. firms at half the rate of what is earned here in the United States by those same companies. If that isn't an invitation for more job outsourcing, I don't know what is.

The corporate tax rate, which Republicans slashed at the expense of the middle class, Social Security, and Medicare, is now at 21 percent; but the rate at which American companies' overseas subsidiaries will be taxed is half that much, 10.5 percent.

Why does the Republican tax bill incentivize U.S. companies to move profits and capital overseas?

Call President Trump, let him know, because that is what he just did.

The Republican bill does nothing to address the job outsourcing crisis. It makes it worse.

Isn't this economic madness?

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM FUNDING

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, nearly 9 million children across the Nation, more than 55,000 in my district alone, rely on the Children's Health Insurance Program for their healthcare.

The deadline to fund CHIP passed and Congress has failed to provide long-term funding for the program, kicking the can down the road and leaving parents worried about whether or not their child will get the healthcare they need, because they are no longer covered, in the middle of a flu season no less.

For decades, Republicans and Democrats have come together to fund the bipartisan and noncontroversial CHIP. It is unacceptable that this time around, Republican leaders proposed paying for CHIP by cutting other critical public health programs that CHIP recipient kids rely on, like vaccines. This is unconscionable.

Stop using children's healthcare as a partisan weapon. Kids and parents deserve better. We must put our children's needs above partisanship and provide for the health of our children with a bipartisan, long-term funding solution for CHIP.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION BACKLOG

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to a dangerous backlog at the Social Security Administration that is harming millions of Americans across the Nation, especially in and around the city of Philadelphia.

Philadelphians face the longest delays in the Nation, where thousands of applicants wait as long as 26 months, on average, for a basic preliminary hearing. Last year alone, 9,000 Americans died awaiting an SSA benefits determination.

In 1974, we made a promise to be there for our elderly, blind, and disabled Americans who have little or no income. They, in turn, rely upon the Social Security Administration to approve their eligibility and administer these life-sustaining benefits.

On Monday, I led a letter with my Democratic colleagues from the Philadelphia area and New Jersey demanding answers from the SSA's leadership.

Today I rise to stand up for the millions of Americans who are on their own, suffering from a crisis of public service that threatens their ability to afford basic necessities through no fault of their own. I will not stand down until this problem is fixed.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF CANDICE BOWERS

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Candice Bowers.

Candice was a single mother to her three children: Kurtis, Katie, and her recently adopted daughter, Ariel.

She was a hardworking waitress who was selfless and always ensured she was able to take care of her family. Candice had a loving heart, a big smile, and an infectious laugh.

She went to the Route 91 music festival in Las Vegas with her best friend so she could take some rare time for herself.

Candice was known for her strength, fierce loyalty, and generosity. She would give her last dollar to anyone who was in need.

I would like to extend my condolences to Candice's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas and the whole country grieve with you.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF LISA HANSEN

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of an extraordinary constituent, Lisa Hansen.

Lisa was an Air Force veteran, a longtime civil servant, and an inspiration to many as an ovarian cancer survivor.

In the final years of her career, Lisa worked as a defense contractor at the legendary Arsenal in Watervliet, New York.

During her 14-year battle with cancer, Lisa became an expert in cancer research and treatment. She used that knowledge and experience to become an advocate and a mentor to fellow survivors.

Ovarian cancer will affect 1 in 75 women. There is no diagnostic tool for it. Raising awareness is one of the best and only ways to get women diagnosed sooner.

Lisa made it her personal mission to reach as many women as possible in New York's capital region and beyond through her leadership at Caring Together, Inc. She also participated in the Survivors Teaching Students program, sharing personal experiences with medical and nursing students.

Lisa passed away on January 6. We will remember her passion and selfless dedication to ovarian cancer research and the extraordinary power in her voice and in her story.

Thank you for a lifetime of service to others, Lisa. You will be sorely missed, but thank you for the inspiration you have provided to so many.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ADAMS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for January 8 through January 11 on account of recovering from surgery.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 11, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3646. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of the anticipated use of Selected Reserve units that will be ordered to active duty, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 12304b(d); Public Law 112-81, Sec. 516(a)(1); (125 Stat. 1396); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3647. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Board of Actuaries, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2017 Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund Report, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1114(c); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 713(a)(1) (114 Stat. 1654A-180); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3648. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that additional time is needed to collect, compile, and analyze submissions for the third quarter inventory of activities performed report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3649. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock [Regulation I; Docket No.: R-1560] (RIN: 7100-AE 68) received December 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3650. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Renewal of Determination of a Public Health Emergency from the consequences of Hurricane Maria on the Territory of the U.S. Virgin Islands and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3651. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety and Effectiveness of Health Care Antiseptics; Topical Antimicrobial Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-0101] (RIN: 0910-AH40) received December 22, 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.

3652. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment [WC Docket No.: 17-84] received December 21, 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.

3653. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of defense articles and services associated with six (6) Presidential Determinations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(2); Public Law 87-195, Sec. 506(b)(2) (as amended by Public Law 96-92, Sec. 5(b)); (93 Stat. 702); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3654. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-043, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3655. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-046, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3656. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-012, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3657. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-088, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3658. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-140, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3659. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3660. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, General Services Administration, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, change in previously submitted reported information, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3661. A letter from the General Counsel, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting a notice of a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3662. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's report on competitive sourcing efforts for FY 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 108-199, Sec. 647(b); (118 Stat. 361); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3663. A letter from the White House Liaison, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3664. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's summary of the inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities performed by federal employees for fiscal year 2016, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3665. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0476; Product Identifier 2016-NM-110-AD; Amendment 39-19111; AD 2017-24-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3666. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1044; Product Identifier 2017-NE-38-AD; Amendment 39-19110; AD 2017-24-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3667. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0709; Product Identifier 2016-NM-200-AD; Amendment 39-19115; AD 2017-25-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3668. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0708; Product Identifier 2017-NM-035-AD; Amendment 39-19113; AD 2017-24-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3669. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1097; Product Identifier 2013-NM-015-AD; Amendment 39-19117; AD 2017-25-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3670. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0340; Product Identifier 2017-NM-002-AD; Amendment 39-19114; AD 2017-24-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3671. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1098; Product Identifier 2012-NM-216-AD; Amendment 39-19116; AD 2017-25-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3672. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-

2017-0556; Product Identifier 2016-NM-098-AD; Amendment 39-19119; AD 2017-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3673. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1117; Product Identifier 94-ANE-39-AD; Amendment 39-19112; AD 2017-24-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3674. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0622; Product Identifier 2016-NM-192-AD; Amendment 39-19120; AD 2017-25-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3675. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1103; Product Identifier 2014-NM-063-AD; Amendment 39-19128; AD 2017-25-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 29, 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.

3676. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2018-3 received December 21, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3677. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Shared Savings Program: Extreme and Uncontrollable Circumstances Policies for Performance Year 2017 [CMS-1702-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AT51) received December 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

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:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3548. A bill to make certain improvements to the security of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–505, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2504. A bill to ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms (Rept. 115–506, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 1285. An act to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands (Rept. 115–507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 453. A bill to deem the Step 2 compliance date for standards of performance for new residential wood heaters, new residential hydronic heaters, and forced-air furnaces to be May 15, 2023 (Rept. 115–508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1917. A bill to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule (Rept. 115–509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2504 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources, Agriculture, Oversight and Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3548 ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3548. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than March 23, 2018.

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 Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 4750. A bill to terminate the granting of temporary protected status to aliens, to provide for adjustment of status for former temporary protected status holders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASO (for himself and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 4751. A bill to reauthorize the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 4752. A bill to establish an Independent Financial Technology Task Force, to provide rewards for information leading to convictions related to terrorist use of digital currencies, to establish a FinTech Leadership in Innovation Fund to encourage the development of tools and programs to combat terrorist and illicit use of digital currencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 4753. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require the Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to provide a written report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 4754. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide prospective construction contractors with information about an agency's policies on the administration of change orders to allow such contractors to make informed business decisions regarding the pricing of bids or proposals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 4755. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to bring the non-monetary policy related functions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System into the appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4756. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to establish a blackout period for public communications by the Federal Open Market Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 4757. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to modify the appointment process for presidents of Federal Reserve Banks; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4758. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require the Federal Open Market Committee to establish interest rates on balances maintained at a Federal Reserve Bank by depository institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4759. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to revise the membership of Federal Open Market Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 4760. A bill to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Homeland Security, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Armed Services, Oversight and Government Reform, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, 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 Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 4761. A bill to address the challenges of providing public services to citizens of the Freely Associated States residing in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, Foreign Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, Agriculture, and 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 Mrs. DEMINGS:

H.R. 4762. A bill to require the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP code for particular communities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4763. A bill to require the pursuit of technologies to remove space debris; to the

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 4764. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish an Office for Under-Banked and Un-Banked Consumers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 4765. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to prohibit the removal of certain items under category I, II, or III of the United States Munitions List for purposes of transferring the item to or controlling the item under any portion of the Commerce Control List of dual-use items in the Export Administration Regulations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 683. A resolution recognizing January 2018 as ''National Mentoring Month'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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 Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 4750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 states that ''Congress shall have the power to establish an uniform rule of naturalization.''

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 4751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 4752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, providing the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states.''

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 4753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution states the Congress shall have 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. BACON:

H.R. 4754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises'' in order to ''provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 4755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8. ''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.''

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4756.

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 oher Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 4757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The explicit power of Congress to establish an uniform Rule of Naturization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throught the United States as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified in to law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed in to law by the President.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4758.

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.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes'').

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 4760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution—The Congress shall have Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 4761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

Article IV Section 3

By Mrs. DEMINGS:

H.R. 4762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 4764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 4765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: 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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 422: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 506: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 547: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 592: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 719: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 850: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 936: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 982: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1038: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 1178: Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 1227: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1243: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1316: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 1322: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1360: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1406: Mr. CORREA and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1409: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1542: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1606: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1749: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 1841: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1972: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1987: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2000: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2001: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2147: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2267: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2345: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2452: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2482: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2528: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2683: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2723: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 2740: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 2832: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 2845: Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 2996: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 3030: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 3067: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 3145: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3174: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 3232: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 3272: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3307: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3492: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 3528: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 3566: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 3602: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3637: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3692: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3782: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3790: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 3792: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3826: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3931: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 3964: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3976: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 4075: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4079: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 4099: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 4124: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 4143: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4179: Ms. TSONGAS and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4215: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4229: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARR, Mr. REED, Mr. HECK, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 4236: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4253: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 4256: Mr. HIMES and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 4265: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4268: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 4274: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 4311: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 4392: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4444: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4479: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 4494: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 4507: Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 4547: Mr. STEWART, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 4584: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 4610: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 4635: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 4647: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4660: Mr. STEWART, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 4681: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 4693: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 4704: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4712: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BRAT, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4715: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 4736: Mr. LONG and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 4737: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 4747: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 35: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 613: Mr. DELANEY.

H. Res. 661: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. HECK, and Mr. CORREA.

H. Res. 673: Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 675: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2018 No. 6

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.

O God, our Savior, help our lawmakers to see eternity beyond time, remaining loyal to You in all things. Awaken in them a desire to represent Your purposes in our Nation and world. Give them grace, O God, to love and to even pray for those who would strive to hurt them. May nothing blind them to Your truth, as You lead them through the night of mortality to the light that never fades. Lord, keep them calm in the quiet center of their lives, so that they may find serenity in life's swirling stresses. And Lord, fill us all with Your peace, as we strive to understand others as we would wish to be understood.

We pray in Your Holy 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, January 10, 2018.

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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Lee Robinson Parker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have been talking all week about the ways our historic tax reform law is immediately helping middle-class families. It has been less than a month since Congress passed and the President signed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, but already more than 1 million Americans are on track to receive special bonuses, permanent raises, and other benefits, and their employers are attributing these changes directly to tax reform.

In fact, 100,000 employees of American Airlines are each receiving a $1,000 tax reform bonus; U.S. Bank is raising its minimum wage to $15 and is also giving $1,000 bonuses to 60,000 employees; 29,000 employees of Nationwide Insurance are also receiving bonuses, and 33,000 are getting an increase in their retirement match. These are just a few of the 100-plus companies that have already announced new benefits for American workers as a direct result of tax reform. These are only the immediate benefits.

Mainstream economists agree that in the months and years to come, the permanent changes we made in the way we tax businesses will make our economy more vibrant and more competitive. That means greater investment and higher wages for American workers. Of course, all this is in addition to the direct effects the tax cuts themselves will soon have on family budgets.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will reduce income tax rates and significantly expand key deductions. We took money out of Washington and put it right back in the pockets of middle-class Americans. Starting as early as February, the IRS will withhold less from paychecks, and workers will get to deposit more of their hard-earned money right into their own bank accounts. In 2018 alone, for a typical family of four earning just over 70,000, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act could mean a tax savings of more than $2,000.

Nearly every day, reports come out about a new way this historic tax reform bill is helping Americans. Here is a subject that is particularly relevant around many kitchen tables this winter: utility bills. All around the country, utility companies that will benefit from our new tax cuts are already discussing plans to pass their savings on to customers.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Major power companies in Illinois, Maryland, and Massachusetts are already proposing plans to give their customers tens of millions of dollars in relief by lowering the rates they charge for energy. And get this: According to CNBC, a South Carolina electric and gas utility is planning to give a cash payment directly to its customers, averaging $1,000 per household. More are following suit. In Montana, Louisiana, and Indiana, regulators are already working with utilities to determine how households will benefit from the tax savings. In my own State of Kentucky, the Public Service Commission directed a number of the electric, gas, and water companies to track their savings and make plans to cut rates for consumers.

As any mother or father who has to balance a checkbook and pay bills every month can attest, this is welcome news for middle-class families. These reductions will be especially helpful to the most vulnerable in our society.

According to data from the Department of Health and Human Services, energy costs eat up a significantly higher percentage of household income for poor families than for other families. In other words, for a software engineer in Silicon Valley, a lower heating or air conditioning bill may go unnoticed, but for workers who clean that office overnight, this relief will make a real difference.

A drop in utility bills effectively amounts to progressive tax relief. This is just another example of how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is rapidly proving to be a serious asset to poor and middle-class families—precisely the people whom my Democratic friends in the House and Senate loudly claimed would get nothing at all from this bill.

It has been 3 weeks—3 weeks—lower utility bills, 1 million special tax reform bonuses and pay raises, and this is only the beginning.

A Republican majority in the House and a Republican majority in the Senate and President Trump listened to the facts instead of the political spin. I am proud that we passed this historic bill and gave families across America the tax relief they have waited decades to receive.

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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we have barely over a week to negotiate a broad package of must-pass items, including an extension of government funding, a deal to lift the spending caps for both defense and urgent domestic priorities, a healthcare package, disaster aid, an agreement to protect the Dreamers, and to provide additional border security.

The path forward on some of these issues is very clear. There are significant bipartisan majorities that would vote to extend CHIP, or the Children's Health Insurance Program, and community health centers. There seems to be a growing consensus on how we can pass the 702 FISA Court program.

I am also confident that we could assemble a disaster aid package that addresses the needs of all of the States and Territories—Texas, Florida, Louisiana, California, the Western States that have been plagued by fires, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands—as well as modifying what the Forest Service does so they don't spend all of their money simply fighting forest fires and not do the job they are intended to do, which is to prevent future forest fires by careful forestry programs.

Even where the path is murkier, the outlines of a deal exist. If we don't lift the spending caps in short order, the sharp ax of sequestration will fall on the military side of the budget and on the domestic side of the budget. That is a scenario everyone wants to avoid.

The majority leader continues to insist that we should raise the budget caps unequally, sparing our military but not critical domestic programs that create jobs, grow our economy, and help the middle class. We Democrats believe we absolutely must provide the resources our men and women overseas need to protect our country. We believe that strongly, but we also know that there are many important issues here at home—combating the opioid crisis, improving veterans' healthcare, shoring up pensions for millions of hard-working Americans who are approaching retirement, and dealing with rural development and rural broadband. These items are all crucial to the middle class.

The deadly scourge of opioid addiction has contributed to the first consecutive-year decline in life expectancy in the great United States of America since the early 1960s. That is an astounding and alarming fact that should rouse everyone in this Chamber to action. It is not occurring in most of our Western country allies.

Some of our veterans have been waiting in line for healthcare at veterans hospitals for over a year. These men and women served our country bravely. We have a solemn responsibility to serve them when they come home, and we are not living up to that responsibility right now.

Over a million Americans paid into pension plans with the expectation that they could retire with basic dignity. For so many of them—teamsters, miners, food workers—pensions have fallen short, and a lifetime of careful savings may be ripped away from pensioners at the last moment. We could make progress on each of these issues through a budget that lifts the spending caps equally for defense and nondefense.

The Republican majority, which conveniently forgot its long history of opposing deficits when passing a $1.5 trillion tax bill, cannot, in good conscience, turn around and complain about deficits here. So let's make the investments we all know are essential in both our military and in our middle class.

Even on the most challenging issue we face, the fate of the Dreamers, there appears to be a path forward. Yesterday's immigration meeting at the White House was encouraging for two reasons. First, practically everyone at the table—including some of the most conservative voices on immigration, like the Senator from Iowa—agreed that we must resolve the future of Dreamers by passing DACA protections into law. That is a very positive development.

Second, President Trump appeared to endorse a narrow deal to protect the Dreamers, leaving the thornier issues for a later debate on comprehensive immigration reform—a debate that, personally, I would welcome, the sooner the better.

But first, we have to do this narrow deal. President Trump also backed off his demand that a DACA deal include an expensive and ineffective border wall across the entire length of the southern border. Of course, the devil is in the details. We Democrats have repeated time and again that we are ready, willing, and eager to support an effective, practical border security measure in a deal that enshrines DACA into law. The President yesterday seemed to agree with that. We agree with that. For these reasons, the meeting was encouraging.

Last night, a Federal judge ruled against the Trump administration's handling of the termination of the DACA Program. Let me be very clear. The ruling last night in no way diminishes the urgency of resolving the DACA issue. On this we agree with the White House, which says the ruling doesn't do anything to reduce Congress's obligation to address this problem now. A court case, of course, is no guarantee of lasting security. A higher court can quickly overturn it. Unsurprisingly, the Department of Justice responded to the ruling last night by saying that it ''will continue to vigorously defend [this] position, and looks forward to vindicating its position in further legislation.'' So the fact remains that the only way to guarantee the legal status for Dreamers is to pass DACA protections into law and to do it now. For that reason, a resolution to the DACA issue must be part of a global deal on the budget.

We cannot tolerate delay. Delay is a tactic employed by those who do not wish to see a deal. Let me just say, promises that maybe in the future we will do it—particularly on immigration—have vanished by the wayside.

Unless DACA is on a must-pass deal—a must-pass bill—in terms of a global agreement, people are rightfully skeptical that it will ever happen. Somehow, somewhere, someone will say: I can't do it.

Let's not forget that the House has been a graveyard even for immigration proposals that have had bipartisan consensus here in the Senate. So it must be on a must-pass bill. Otherwise, we are not going to get it.

Congressional negotiators and the valiant group here in the Senate led by Senators DURBIN and GRAHAM are focused on this issue right now. The meeting they had yesterday—I talked to both Senators DURBIN and GRAHAM last night and this morning—provides a clearer picture of the parameters of the deal. The iron is hot. We should strike now. Delay will snuff out the hope of getting an agreement that both sides can live with. Let us press forward. Each side is going to have to give.

I am confident, though, that both sides can come to an agreement on border security. I am convinced now both sides want to find a consensus on DACA. Some will support a deal enthusiastically, others reluctantly, but, nonetheless, an agreement is within reach. We ought to get it done through the Senate, through the House, and onto the President's desk for signature now. So let's get the job done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

ISSUES BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, here we are at the start of a new year. Last year, the Republican majority decided to dedicate the year to government by and for the powerful and the privileged, but how about this year, 2018? We pay attention to our Constitution, which starts with that vision of government, not for the powerful, not for the rich, not for the privileged, not for the well connected, not for the wealthy but for the people of the United States. It is a vision where power is distributed, and power comes up from each individual citizen to create policies for their general welfare.

Last year, we saw this complete dedication to trying to wipe out healthcare for 20 million to 30 million Americans in order to provide tax benefits for the richest. How big were those tax benefits? Well, if you add up the provisions that are dedicated to the powerful corporations and those benefits for the wealthiest 10 percent, and most of that goes to the wealthiest 1 percent, those provisions stack up to over $2 trillion—$2 trillion.

It is very hard to get your hands around $2 trillion. Those are not numbers we use in ordinary conversation. Let's take that down to the amount of money per man, woman, and child—per citizen in America. Well, that is about $6,000—$6,000 taken from the community funds for every man, woman, and child in America to deliver to the wealthiest Americans. That was government by the Republican majority in 2017. It was not ''We the People'' but we the powerful and we the privileged.

How about we have a new year's resolution that pays attention to the vision of our Constitution, to that vision of government of, by, and for the people?

Ben Franklin once wrote in his ''Poor Richard's Almanac'':

> Be at war with your vices,
> At peace with your neighbors,
> And let every New Year find you a better man.

Every new year is a chance to recreate and reenvision where we are headed. Certainly, it is a big vice to use this Chamber, in contravention of our Constitution, to pursue policies for the powerful and privileged rather than for the people. So let's set that vice aside and have a bipartisan year, dedicated to making a foundation for families to thrive and jobs and education and healthcare and a healthier planet.

Right now, we should have an immediate new year's checklist of things to get done, and that checklist starts with the budget. We have just 9 days until funding runs out for the Federal Government, and we all know from experience what that means—parks shut down, medical research stops, passports don't get processed, and businesses can't check in on their I–9 applications for employees. That is the type of conduct that happens in banana republics—basically, in countries that don't have a competent system of government. It should not happen in the United States of America.

We are deep into the financial year, which started on October 1. October passed. November passed. December passed. We are well into January and still the majority leadership of this body is unable to put together a process that addresses just key, fundamental issues. Why is that? Because they were so distracted by delivering trillions of dollars to the richest of Americans and trying to destroy healthcare for millions of Americans that they didn't tend to the fundamentals that need to be tended to. Let's take care of those things now.

The Children's Health Insurance Program. Here we are. It expired on September 30 of last year. Nine million children across America depend on this insurance. This insurance was crafted in a bipartisan manner. It was forged in an agreement between Senator HATCH, a Republican, and Senator KENNEDY, a Democrat, who had very different visions of America but who could agree that families who didn't qualify for Medicaid and weren't affluent enough to buy insurance for their children could still have insurance for their children. These are the working poor of America, the struggling workers of America.

It was forged in a bipartisan manner, but this year my Republican colleagues decided to make these children a bargaining chip for their effort to get more for the privileged and the powerful. That has to end.

When children do not have insurance, they don't get that dental benefit to take care of those cavities. They don't get that medical exam. They don't get those inoculations, those vaccinations. They don't get treatment when they are injured because their parents can't afford to take them to the doctor. They don't get treatment when they are sick for the same reason. Let's take care of children's healthcare.

This is not a partisan issue. It was forged in a bipartisan manner, and it should be so today.

What also expired on September 30 of last year was the legislation authorizing support for our community health clinics. Community health clinics are the front door to healthcare for millions of Americans. It is that friendly place in your rural community, in your urban neighborhood, where you can go through the front door and get assistance.

Talking about millions of Americans who go through those front doors, there are more than 1,400 clinics across the country. These are popular in rural areas. They are popular in urban areas. They are popular in red States. They are popular in blue States. There is nothing partisan about it, but the leadership of this body has no interest, has seen no urgency in reauthorizing the ability for those health centers to stay open.

In Oregon we saw, as a result of the Affordable Care Act, 30 more health clinics established. We saw a lot more resources go into both mental illness and into drug abuse during a period in which the opioid crisis joined the meth crisis and afflicted both rural and urban areas. Lots of folks come to this floor and say: We have to take on opioids. It is not just on the left-hand side of the aisle, but it is also on the right-hand side of the aisle. People base virtually their entire campaigns on taking on opioids. Yet the Republican leadership says this isn't important. Let me tell you, this is important, and we need to get it done.

Then let's turn to the Dream Act. Dreamers are those children raised in our communities, now 16 through their midtwenties. They are productive members of our communities. They have gone through our high schools or are in high school now. They are in college. They are working. They are contributing. They know no other country than ours.

Across both sides of the aisle we hear folks say: We want to take care of them and establish a structure for this, a legal structure for the Dreamers.

The President yesterday hosted a bipartisan conversation at the White House to say: Let's get this done. He expressed his support. In fact, everyone in the room expressed support for getting this done.

Each one of these—the budget, the children's healthcare, the health centers, the Dream Act—are bipartisan efforts. These are things that should have been addressed long ago if my Republican colleagues instead weren't so

obsessed with decimating healthcare for millions of Americans and ripping off the National Treasury to deliver benefits to the wealthiest Americans.

Let's get this done for our Dreamers. More than 100 a day are losing their status, which means they can no longer legally work in our country. It matters. It is urgent. It is productive for our communities. It is bipartisan. Let's get it done.

How about disaster relief? We certainly saw a powerful punch against our States from the raging forest fires in the West to the hurricanes in the South and Southeast. Hurricanes have hit Texas and Florida and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands—massive destruction. Fires have scourged States from Montana to Idaho, to Washington, to Oregon, to California. Those fires burned well into the winter months of November and December.

These afflictions hit Democrats and Republicans, red States and blue States. Why don't we get this done? These are basic, bipartisan, let's-get-it-done agendas. Let's get it done now.

Let's make sure, when we are addressing the impact of those storms in the South and those hurricanes—Harvey, Irma, and Maria—we simultaneously recognize the destructive impact forest fires have had that have been scourging the West. They have destroyed a lot of the infrastructure in the forest that needs to be replaced. They have affected a lot of communities that need economic help recovering.

Certainly, it made us recognize that we have millions of acres of forests that can become much more fire resilient if they are thinned, if we get rid of the fuel buildup on the floor of the forests. When they become more resilient, they stop the forest fires.

Thinning is a win-win. It produces a steady supply of sawlogs for the mill and stops forest fires when they are raging. There was a forest fire headed right for Sisters, OR, and it hit an area that had been thinned. Guess what. It stopped. The trees were farther apart. The fuels were removed from the floor of the forest.

Now we have created a real fire hazard with our clear-cut strategy of years past—the forestry grows very close together, often replanted. Trees are all the same height. It is very easy for the fire to get into the canopy, and once in the canopy, every tree is touching the next tree. It rages on, and there is no break.

But a natural forest is very different. We can more effectively replicate the fire-resistant nature of a natural forest by thinning these overgrown, second-growth forests. We can then create that supply of saw logs, keep our mills open, keep our people working, and strengthen our economies in rural America. We can do it by funding this reduction, these thinning programs in acreage that has already gone through the environmental process. In Oregon, we have 1.6 million acres already approved for thinning, if we can pass the funds to get it done.

So let's take this on in 2018. Let's dedicate 2018 to that vision in our Constitution of ''we the people.'' Let's stop passing legislation targeted specifically to help out the richest at the expense of everyone else in America. Let's turn over a new leaf from campaigns and policies and legislation by and for the privileged and the powerful to honor the vision of our Constitution, the vision of our Nation, a Nation of laws which distributes power that produces policies by and for the people of the United States of America, for making families stronger, for building those foundations of jobs and healthcare and education and a healthy planet.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

FUNDING OUR MILITARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I admit I wasn't here during the entirety of the comments from our friend, and I saw his to-do list. The only thing missing from that to-do list was to fund our military—or at least I didn't see it on there. In all fairness, maybe he mentioned that in his comments.

We now have 9 days to reach an agreement to keep the government funded, to keep the lights on, to keep paying the salaries of our government employees, and, of course, to fund our military, which ought to be our No. 1 priority. If we think about things that government must do, funding our national defense is the only thing that we can do and that government can do. There are a lot of other things that government does that are optional or maybe things we would like to do, but funding our military is the No. 1 priority—or should be.

As the Senate majority leader mentioned earlier this week, our Democratic colleagues persist in the notion that we should only increase defense spending if we increase nondefense spending by the same amount. The parity that the minority leader and the other Democrats call for doesn't make any sense, though. It is apples and oranges. They act as though all government spending is exactly alike and enjoys or should enjoy the same priority, and that is just not true. We know that from our own family budgets or from a small business. There are things we must do, things we want to do, and things we will do if there is money left over. But our friends across the aisle, who are obstructing our ability to get to negotiated budget caps and fund our military, act as though all of that is the same, that must do, want to do, and what you will do if you have money left over—that those are all exactly the same, and that is just not the case. It is not the case in our family budgets, in our small business budgets, nor is it the case for the Federal budget. Not everything is a priority. But we do know that the No. 1 priority must be the safety and security of the American people by making sure our military is adequately funded.

The Budget Control Act signed into law in 2011 was what I would call a necessary evil. The Budget Control Act provided that we would have a bipartisan, bicameral negotiation and try to come up with a grand bargain.

That was what President Obama liked to talk about a lot—the grand bargain. But some people suggested that was kind of like a unicorn, something that people describe but no one has ever seen—a grand bargain. I wish it weren't true.

The Budget Control Act said that in the absence of a grand bargain, we would have budget caps or sequestration imposed on discretionary spending above certain levels. It proposed separate budget caps for defense and nondefense, and if the budget caps are exceeded, there is an automatic enforcement mechanism called sequestration which imposes across-the-board cuts, which I mentioned a moment ago.

The purpose of this sequestration—or these across-the-board cuts—is to do something in the absence of us doing what we should do; in other words, we should take it upon ourselves to figure out what the appropriate spending levels should be for defense and nondefense, and then we should act to appropriate that money. But this is basically a fail-safe mechanism, which operates as a result of our failure to deal with this in a proactive way, and it has hit our defense spending much, much harder than domestic spending.

As we know, neither our defense spending nor tax cuts are the cause of our deficits and debt. It is the 70 percent of spending that happens in the Federal Government on autopilot. It is the entitlements that have been going up well in excess of 5 percent a year and are causing instability and unpredictability in those important programs, such as Medicare and Social Security, but at the same time racking up huge deficits and debt that future generations are going to have to pay back. Somebody is going to have to pay it back, and it won't be the present generation because we won't be around then. It is simply immoral to continue to see this happen without trying to deal with it.

But back on the matter of the Pentagon, as one op-ed writer put it in the Washington Post last month—he said:

> The Pentagon and the welfare state have been locked in brutal combat for decades, and the Pentagon has gotten clobbered. . . . Welfare programs—Social Security, Medicare, food stamps and other benefits—dwarf defense spending.

In the 1950s and 1960s, defense spending was roughly 8 to 10 percent of our economy. In 2016, it was just 3 percent. That is a huge change.

James Clapper, the former Director of National Intelligence, said that in his 50 years in the intelligence community, he had never seen a more diverse array of threats confronting the United States around the world—never in his

50 years of experience. So we are simply asking our military and our national security personnel to do too much with too little.

It is no surprise that Secretary of Defense James Mattis said last June that ''for all the heartache caused by the loss of our troops during [our] wars [abroad], no enemy in this field has done more to harm the readiness of our military than sequestration.''

More recently, General Mattis said that so far our continuing resolutions have not done even greater damage to our readiness thanks to certain additional or supplemental funding that we voted on. But at the same time, he soberly cautioned that there could be real impact—and it won't be positive, it will be negative—if the problem persists and if the Department of Defense doesn't have a real budget sometime this month.

His remarks echo that of practically every service chief. Together, their views mean we have to act. I don't know who else we would listen to if we are not going to listen to the Secretary of Defense and our service chiefs when it comes to national security because that is their job, and we ought to take their advice and heed their counsel.

Cuts in defense spending have real consequences. Much less money is available for training and necessary maintenance, for example. The length of deployments for our troops grows, and our soldiers are stretched thin. Our military is forced to operate beyond its normal capabilities.

The former Air Force Chief of Staff recently described the Air Force as the smallest, oldest equipped, and least ready force across the full spectrum of operations in our service history. Those are chilling remarks—or should be. More than half of all Marine Corps fixed and rotary-wing aircraft were unable to fly by the end of 2016. I have no doubt that we can turn that around very quickly if Congress were to step up to its responsibilities and adequately fund the military, but that is the status quo unless we act. The Navy fleet currently stands at 275 of the 350 ship requirement. Of our 58 Army brigade combat teams, only 3—3 out of 58—are ready for combat.

Our enemies shouldn't take any comfort in these numbers because, as I said, the United States always pulls together and Congress always acts when they see a national emergency. But it shouldn't take an emergency for us to do our job and to make sure that our military is adequately funded and is ready to fight. As General Brooks in Seoul, South Korea, said, their motto is ''ready to fight tonight.'' That is the kind of world we live in.

Last summer was the perfect example of why, when we draw attention to these numbers, we are not just blowing smoke. Operational accidents in the South Pacific exposed our readiness failures in a dramatic fashion and in a tragic fashion. Ten sailors died when the USS *John S. McCain* collided with a 600-foot merchant vessel off the coast of Singapore. Seven sailors died when the *Fitzgerald* collided with another vessel off the coast of Japan. And the USS *Lake Champlain* collided with a boat near Korea—although thankfully that time no lives were lost. This ought to be a wake-up call to all of us.

Many have drawn credible correlations between these accidents that have taken the lives of our military servicemembers and our readiness failures, citing studies like the 2015 independent investigation by the Government Accountability Office. That study determined that the Navy's mandate to keep ships afloat in the Pacific was shortchanging crew training and degrading the condition of our ships—in other words, additional readiness failures.

These accidents, by the way, are happening at the same time our national security threats are not going away, as General Clapper's comments would indicate.

We have seen North Korea continue to improve its nuclear and long-range ballistic missile capabilities beyond the estimates of our intelligence community—much faster—and detonate what is widely considered to be a hydrogen bomb recently.

We have seen large-scale protests in Iran—and I hope they continue—exposing the instability of a regime that continues to use its proxies to advance its aims throughout the broader Middle East; in other words, the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism—Iran. We ought to encourage the people of Iran to continue to rise up in protest and to change the regime there into one that does not prey on its neighbors in the region.

We have seen a growing China—something that more and more people are realizing is a threat. I know that when we deal with countries like China, frequently we deal with them in the commercial context where we see a business that hires people and we see investments here in the United States. But what we need to recognize is that they don't do business the way the United States does business. Sitting at the top of every company in China, in the board room of every Chinese company, is the Communist Party. They operate on an all-of-government basis. And it is not just the government; it is also what we would consider the private sector. But, in truth, there is no private sector in China; it is all an arm of the government. It is posing a rising threat to American wages and labor as they erode our industrial base by stealing our technology. And because of loopholes in the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States—the so-called CFIUS process—they are now able to tailor financial arrangements through joint ventures and others in a way to capture our dual-purpose, cutting-edge technology. They then copy it in China and erode our defense industrial base here in the United States, along with the jobs that go with it. So it is a very real and present threat to American wages and workers. It is a threat to our intellectual property edge and the innovation that we are the best in the world at, but they are all too eager to steal it, copy it, and to harm the jobs and the investment in those businesses here in the United States.

Of course, when it comes to China, there is the threat to human rights in nondemocratic nations like Venezuela and Zimbabwe, which China often has no qualms supporting.

With this diverse array of dangers, we simply can't afford to straitjacket our military by arbitrarily cutting the amount of money we appropriate to fund it. But that is what is going to happen unless we act—and act quickly. The current continuing resolution expires on the 19th of this month.

The truth is, even if we are able to come up with negotiated budget caps for defense and nondefense spending, we are probably going to have to have a short-term continuing resolution to give the Appropriations Committees time to put that into bill text. In other words, we can't just snap our fingers once the decision has been made. It is going to take some time to actually put it on paper.

The bottom line is, if we want to return to having the strong military that we have always had, if we want to continue to lead in the world, if we want to continue to be a force for peace and stability, we have to maintain our military strength. That was the lesson we had to learn again during the last administration when we saw America retreat from its leadership in the world.

There are countries, tyrants, bullies, and dictators all too willing to fill the void left by American retreat, and one way we retreat is when we don't fund the readiness of our military, when we are not ''ready to fight tonight,'' as General Brooks has said, and we need to start with ending this cycle of continuing resolutions and defense sequestration.

So I come to the floor today to call on my colleagues from all across this Chamber, but specifically across the aisle, to quit holding our military hostage to other unrelated demands, and I urge this body to come together in agreement on new budget caps as soon as possible.

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.

Mrs. MURRAY. 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.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

CHIP AND COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about an issue that is critical to patients and families in my home State of Washington and across the country. Today, parents are wondering if they will be able to get the healthcare their kids need, and communities are wondering if they will be able to provide it.

That is unacceptable.

Congress has to swiftly and fully restore the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, and funding for other services families need, like community health centers, which have been waiting more than 100 days for a long-term solution. They should do so without making deep cuts to successful prevention programs in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention that tackle avoidable conditions like heart disease and diabetes.

Democrats have wanted to get this done for months. By focusing on pushing through partisan tax reform at the end of the year, Republicans instead put massive corporations and the wealthiest ahead of making sure our children and their families have the healthcare they need. I hope they are now ready to give these issues their full and immediate attention. In case they aren't, I want to make sure they know exactly what this is about.

It is about children like Stella. Stella lives in Washington State. She is 5 years old. She has two brothers. She has a love of the outdoors, especially swimming and kayaking. She has a typical kindergartner's boundless energy and excitement. But Stella was born with spina bifida, an issue with how her spinal cord was formed. In the past year of dealing with that condition, Stella's family went through 5 catheters a day, almost 2,000 in total. They went on 10 different occasions to have MRI scans. They went to get her new leg braces. Given the cost of all that, they went through their $5,000 deductible in the first 5 weeks of the year. That is right. It took just 5 weeks. Additionally, this year Stella is also scheduled to have bladder and kidney surgery.

As one can imagine, the expenses are really adding up. Even with both parents working, covering Stella's healthcare needs would be an unimaginable task. Fortunately, Stella does qualify for health insurance through CHIP. CHIP has helped her family afford the treatment she needs, including physical therapy.

Stella's story is just one of many examples of families who rely on this program. There are 60,000 children in Washington State who are now insured through CHIP. Nine million families nationwide rely on it to help address the healthcare needs of their children. Yet Congress has taken over 102 days and counting to restore it. There is no excuse for this inaction.

Families who rely on the CHIP Program are not alone in needing our immediate attention. Thanks to CHIP and Medicaid, the uninsured rate among children is now at an all-time low. Jeopardizing this accomplishment by letting CHIP twist in the wind is simply unacceptable. This Republican-controlled Congress has also failed to renew other investments that our families rely on for the care they need—programs such as community health centers, which serve 25 million patients, particularly in our rural and poorer communities; the National Health Service Corps, which brings doctors and other healthcare providers to underserved areas through scholarships and loan repayment; and the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education Program, which brings primary care and dental residencies to communities in need. Leaving these programs without long-term extensions a minute longer is utterly irresponsible because this lack of certainty for them is already bringing a negative impact on our communities.

For example, the Northeast Washington Health Programs serve some of most the rural areas in my State, including Ferry County, which has fewer than four people per square mile. They are struggling to hire needed medical staff and managers because of this uncertainty that is now there. Ferry County cannot wait.

The Community Health Association of Spokane runs 12 health center sites and sees more than 70,000 patients a year. They recently began offering very much needed opioid addiction treatment. If Congress does not reauthorize the community health center funding, those efforts will be jeopardized and expansions will be halted. Spokane cannot wait.

Yakima Neighborhood Health Services served over 22,000 patients in 2016. Almost all of those patients were below 200 percent of the Federal poverty line.

If Congress does not act soon, three different clinics, including a clinic in one of the poorest cities in Washington, will be at risk. Yakima cannot wait.

I have heard additional stories of similar hardships from across my State. North Olympic Healthcare Network has had to put expansions on behavioral healthcare on hold. Another health center in Washington may have to reconsider building a new children's dental residency program. A center serving Whatcom County may have to cancel a project for medical, dental, and behavioral healthcare facilities as well.

Across the country there are a lot of examples for community health centers just like the ones I mentioned. Healthcare that people of all ages and backgrounds rely on is being put in jeopardy, all because Republicans prioritized tax cuts for those at the top before the health needs of millions of people at the end of last year.

It is far past time to show these families that we are willing to work to get this done. We need to give them the peace of mind that they can get the healthcare they need. They deserve that.

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. NELSON. 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.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 2292 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. NELSON. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

DACA

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, I rise today to stand up for the hundreds of thousands of young immigrants known as Dreamers, whose lives President Trump has thrown into terrifying uncertainty.

Immigrant communities have long helped write the economic, social, and cultural story of my home State of New Mexico and, for that matter, the entire Nation. That is certainly true for Dreamers, undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as children and are vital members of communities across New Mexico.

Over the years, I have had the privilege of meeting many of New Mexico's estimated 7,000 Dreamers. I have met with students who grew up here and are now striving to become doctors, scientists, teachers, and even serve in our military. These young people are our children's classmates. They are our next-door neighbors. They are our colleagues. They are family members, and many are truly rising stars. In fact, I would argue that these Dreamers are the future of a great America.

Every day these young people add to the strength of our economy, to the vitality of our country. More than 97 percent of DACA recipients are in school or in the workforce.

The DACA Program allowed them to work legally, to get driver's licenses, to go to college, to serve in our military and give back to their communities. DACA helped almost 70 percent of recipients secure a job with better pay, and better pay leads to real investments in our communities and our economy.

After their DACA applications were approved, nearly two-thirds of recipients reported buying their first car, and almost one in six reported buying a new home. DACA recipients also paid billions of dollars in Federal, State, and local taxes. Why on Earth would

we kick out these contributors to our economy and our country?

The economic impact of removing nearly 700,000 workers from the U.S. workforce would be staggering. It would cost our economy nearly half a trillion dollars in GDP loss over the next decade. But passing the Dream Act could add an estimated $281 billion to the U.S. economy over the next 10 years. That, to me, sounds like putting America first.

I stand with these Dreamers, and I always have. One of my first actions when I was in the House of Representatives was to sign on as an original cosponsor of the Dream Act, which would create a pathway to legal status and citizenship for Dreamers who pursue higher education or serve our Nation in uniform. This commonsense, compassionate, and responsible policy is long overdue for a generation of young Americans.

Since President Trump made the heartless decision to end DACA, I have held his administration accountable for their mishandling of renewal applications for DACA recipients. My office has assisted Dreamers in New Mexico through the DACA renewal process and is actively participating in meetings with communities and local advocacy groups throughout the State.

I introduced legislation to safeguard Dreamers' private information, such as addresses and telephone numbers, so the Trump administration can't use those to target them or their families for deportation.

When my office learned that the Department of Homeland Security had arbitrarily rejected hundreds of renewal applications that arrived late because they were delayed by the Postal Service, I pressed the administration to take immediate action to reverse its decision. I am pleased to say that Dreamers whose applications were rejected due to Postal Service delays were allowed to resubmit their renewals for DACA. In fact, just last week, the first two DACA recipients in New Mexico, who brought this to my attention with the help of Catholic Charities, were told that they could move forward with their DACA renewal applications.

President Trump's decision means that until Congress passes the Dream Act, these young members of our communities still face deep uncertainty about whether they will be able to stay in school, keep working and contributing to our economy, and remain in the Nation that they call home.

Congress must pass the Dream Act now. Threatening to deport these young people who grew up in America and want to contribute to their Nation will not fix our broken immigration system. Making the American people foot the bill to build an unnecessary and wasteful border wall—which families in New Mexico's border communities have told me they do not want nor do they need—will not fix our broken immigration system.

President Trump and congressional Republicans wasted an entire year trying to take away American's healthcare and then rushing through tax breaks for the superwealthy in the final weeks of the year. By squandering an entire year, they pushed Dreamers aside and put their lives in jeopardy.

I voted to fund the government through the holidays in hopes that Congress could finally reach an agreement to pass the Dream Act. We also urgently need to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, fix wildfire disaster funding, provide disaster relief for Puerto Rico, which is still recovering from Hurricane Maria. Taking care of these long-neglected and bipartisan priorities is the bare minimum of governance. Republican leaders in Congress need to take this opportunity seriously, especially if they expect our support.

I will be fighting every step of the way to pass the Dream Act, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Since President Trump shamefully pulled the rug out from under Dreamers when he hastily ended the DACA Program, I have spent time meeting with Dreamers in New Mexico, as well as here in Washington. You cannot hear their stories without realizing how morally bankrupt the administration's current policy is. It is impossible for me to convey the desperation and the fear they are feeling every day that passes without our passing the Dream Act.

Now is the time to give these young Americans a permanent place in this great Nation. Enough is enough. Their patience has worn thin with the President and congressional Republicans using them as political bargaining chips. It is immoral to play politics with the lives of these young Americans.

I will say it again. Congress absolutely must pass the Dream Act, and we have an opportunity to do it now.

We should not stop once we pass the Dream Act. Leaders in Congress have waited far too long to finally address our Nation's overall broken immigration system. I still continue to believe that our Nation urgently needs Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform, which includes a visa program that meets the needs of our economy. It is a tough but fair path to earn citizenship for the estimated 11 million people in our country who are undocumented and a plan that ensures community safety and security at our borders.

When I think about immigration, I always wonder how different my own life would be if America had turned my father away when he immigrated here as a young boy. Our Nation's enduring spirit has been built by the hard work and the dreams of so many striving young immigrants like my father in the 1930s and like so many Dreamers today. No Member of Congress should be able to rest until Dreamers are able to rest easy, knowing they will be able to stay and to contribute to literally the only Nation they have ever called home.

Thank you.

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. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, just last week we began the second session of the 115th Congress. We are now safely into 2018, and we should be talking about what we can accomplish for the American people in the new year. We simply face a long list of unfinished business from 2017—last year—and, unfortunately, we have a very short window in which to get it done.

We are 4 months into fiscal year 2018, and we still don't have a budget deal. I am vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee. We should have had this done long before now. Our agencies are operating under last year's funding levels. They have little flexibility to handle the problems they face today.

We still haven't reauthorized the Children's Health Insurance Program, what we call CHIP, so that puts the healthcare of 9 million children at risk. These are American children.

Nearly 800,000 Dreamers live under uncertainty and fear of deportation, living in the country they have known most of their lives. I don't know how anybody, Republican or Democrat, could call this acceptable.

Now, I know the Republicans control the House, they control the Senate, and they control the White House. They are in charge. They have to show responsibility and show leadership on these issues, but instead of addressing these issues, last year the Republican leadership spent time rolling back sensible regulations designed to protect the American consumer, designed to protect our environment, and designed to protect people from harassment in the workplace. They rolled those all back, and then they passed a massive tax cut for big corporations and the wealthiest of Americans.

We Democrats have been calling for bipartisan budget talks since June—7 months ago. We have passed three continuing resolutions since September of last year to give us more time to strike a deal on the budget and Dreamers and CHIP and disaster funding. These are just to name a few, but they are enormously important to the people who are experiencing the disasters or who have children who need healthcare or who are Dreamers. Yet, on the 102nd day of the fiscal year, there are only 9 days until the next fiscal cliff, and we don't have a budget deal.

President Trump said months ago that the country could use a good government shutdown. I don't agree with

him, but I am beginning to think that is exactly what his party is angling for—a manufactured crisis to distract from the fact that they are not doing their job.

The Washington Post seemed to confirm this last December, when it reported the President privately told people that a government shutdown would be good for him politically. In all of my years in the Senate—I have been here under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike—I have never heard such damaging rhetoric come from the President of the United States.

Nobody wants a government shutdown—nobody. It is devastating to people not only throughout the government but to people throughout the whole country. However, that seems to be what they are vying for.

For months, I have been calling for a bipartisan budget deal that is based on parity—equal increases for defense and nondefense programs—that would provide relief from sequestration. I agree with the Republicans and Democrats who say military readiness has suffered under sequestration but so has our Nation's economy, so has our educational system, so has our infrastructure, and so has our care for our veterans.

If we want to combat the problems caused by sequestration, we have to raise the caps on both sides of the ledger. Fixing one side of the equation will not address the needs of our Nation and, even worse, will actually shortchange our military.

If we don't invest in our economy, if we don't invest in the education of our youth, the military will not have expert, qualified soldiers, the men and women on whom they rely. If we don't invest in our diplomacy, our Nation and the world become less safe. If we don't improve our cyber security defenses and our physical infrastructure, we become soft targets for those who would do us harm, both in this country and outside this country. If we don't care for our veterans, we are not going to have young men and women who are willing to serve.

This week, the majority leader came to the floor making the case for increased defense spending. He asked us to listen to our nonpartisan military leaders about what they think is needed to keep this country safe. I couldn't agree more.

To that end, I have two letters signed by a combined 560 retired admirals, generals, and other former military members. I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

I have no idea what these admirals', generals', and others' political parties are, but they make the case that we have to increase our investment in domestic priorities—including education and childcare, as well as diplomacy—if we are going to keep our country safe and support our military. Secretary of Defense Mattis said even more bluntly: If we do not fully fund the State Department, we should be prepared to buy more ammunition for our military.

The wisdom of our military leaders notwithstanding, Republicans appear to be dug in. They claim equal increases for both defense and nondefense programs would add too much to our deficit and burden our children. It is one over the other. It is hard to have somebody say that with a straight face in the wake of the President signing a tax bill to add $1.5 trillion to our Nation's debt and to benefit primarily large corporations and the wealthiest Americans. You can't make the argument that we can't afford to take care of our domestic needs. It is simply not credible.

Budget negotiations are not the only place where Republicans haven't engaged in a productive way. President Trump's decision to end the DACA Program has put nearly 800,000 Dreamers in this country in an untenable position. The decision was as cruel as it was senseless. It may make a tweet that people look at, but if you are one of those Dreamers and you are on your way to school and are expecting a scholarship to college and you don't know if you are going to be in this country tomorrow, that is not a tweet.

The President should have worked with Congress. He should have found a permanent legislative solution while keeping DACA protections in place. I believe he terminated the program under false pretenses, yielding to xenophobic voices in his administration, and last night a Federal judge issued an order that said just that: Terminating DACA was not required under the law—far from it. But a court order that only temporarily halts the administration from dismantling DACA provides little comfort to Dreamers. They live each and every day uncertain of the future and with fear of deportation.

Now, I have heard Members of the Senate trying to decide at what time we are going to finish voting for the week. Their big fear is this: Are we going to make our flight home?

Dreamers have to worry if their flight is going to be out of this country and back to a country they don't even know. They worry if they will have to leave the country they know and love.

Dreamers are Americans in every way, except on paper. They were brought here as children, through no fault of their own. They are law-abiding members of our community. They attend school. They serve as doctors and teachers. They defend our homeland as brave men and women in uniform.

This is a crisis of the President's own making. Now, Congress needs to pick up the pieces. I hope, after the meeting yesterday, we will be allowed to pick up the pieces. We have spent months trying to find a path forward, but you can't find one if the administration keeps moving the goalposts.

We need to address the fate of the Dreamers now. You can take a poll in this country. The American people want us to. Also, look at the broad bipartisan support on display yesterday at the White House. Republicans and Democrats want to fix the mess that the President created. A solution should be within our grasp.

The White House has made unreasonable demands, such as $18 billion of American tax dollars to build a wall on the southern border, in exchange for Dreamers. The $18 billion wall is last century's solution. It does nothing for this century.

If they really believe Mexico is going to pay for it, I have a solution. Open a bank account and, as Mexico sends us money, then use it to build a wall. Don't ask the American taxpayers, who are strapped at home, to pay for something the President says the Mexicans will pay for. Open an account, find out if they are telling the truth, let the money come into the account, and then build it.

But, worse, don't use the Dreamers as negotiable commodities. They are not commodities. They are human beings. They are people who deserve to have their dreams. Let's pass a bill—we could do it this week—protecting Dreamers now. Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House. This is their government.

We have a week and a half before the next continuing resolution expires. We have a lot to do. Let's get serious. Let's get to work. I am willing to work here every day, every night, right through the weekend. Let's get it done. We are not doing it for us. We are doing it for all the American people. Let's do it for all the American people—not for special interests, not for one party. Let's do it for all the American people. It could be done, if we want to.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSION: READINESS,
COUNCIL FOR A STRONG AMERICA,
May 30, 2017.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As retired admirals and generals, we know from our experience that no matter how much we spend to build our military and procure the latest and greatest technology, we will never be a secure nation if we do not have qualified and skilled men and women to fill the ranks of our Armed Forces. Therefore, investing in education for our youngest children, which is the foundation of our future national security, is essential. Accordingly, we urge Congress to prioritize investments in early childhood programs, including funding for Head Start, the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG), and Preschool Development Grants in FY18 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill.

Mission: Readiness is the national security organization of retired top military leaders that recognize the strength of our military depends on our people. The stunning fact is that today, 71 percent of young adults ages 17 to 24 cannot qualify for military service because they are too poorly educated, medically or physically unfit, or have a disqualifying record of crime or drug abuse. if these issues are not addressed, the Nation risks a shortage of qualified recruits—one that will leave the country vulnerable for years to come.

Mounting research shows that the early years of life have an incredible impact on educational attainment, behaviors and health. High-quality early interventions can help vulnerable children succeed in school, stay on the right side of the law and achieve a healthy weight in the long-term. These outcomes open the doors for many career paths, including military service.

Long-term studies of early education programs show impressive differences in children's educational outcomes. A recent analysis of Head Start outcomes, comparing siblings who did versus did not attend the program, found participants showing increased probability of graduating from high school, attending college, and receiving a postsecondary credential. High-quality state preschool programs have also demonstrated lasting effects on students' elementary-school performance. New Jersey's preschool program, for example, found that children in the program were three-quarters of a year ahead in math and two-thirds of a year ahead in literacy in the fourth and fifth grades.

While Congress faces tough spending choices ahead to secure and protect our Nation, we know that the backbone of our military is, and will always be, our women and men in uniform. As a matter of national security, in order to grow the pool of eligible recruits, Congress must prioritize investments in early childhood programs, including funding for Head Start, the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG), and Preschool Development Grants.

Signed by a combined 424 retired admirals, generals, and other former military members.

FEBRUARY 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate.
Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER: As you and your colleagues address the federal budget for Fiscal Year 2018, we write as retired three and four star flag and general officers from all branches of the armed services to share our strong conviction that elevating and strengthening diplomacy and development alongside defense are critical to keeping America safe.

We know from our service in uniform that many of the crises our nation faces do not have military solutions alone—from confronting violent extremist groups like ISIS in the Middle East and North Africa to preventing pandemics like Ebola and stabilizing weak and fragile states that can lead to greater instability. There are 65 million displaced people today, the most since World War II, with consequences including refugee flows that are threatening America's strategic allies in Israel, Jordan, Turkey, and Europe.

The State Department, USAID, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Peace Corps and other development agencies are critical to preventing conflict and reducing the need to put our men and women in uniform in harm's way. As Secretary James Mattis said while Commander of U.S. Central Command, ''If you don't fully fund the State Department, then I need to buy more ammunition.'' The military will lead the fight against terrorism on the battlefield, but it needs strong civilian partners in the battle against the drivers of extremism—lack of opportunity, insecurity, injustice, and hopelessness.

We recognize that America's strategic investments in diplomacy and development—like all of U.S. investments—must be effective and accountable. Significant reforms have been undertaken since 9/11, many of which have been embodied in recent legislation in Congress with strong bipartisan support—on human trafficking, the rights of women and girls, trade and energy in Africa, wildlife trafficking, water, food security, and transparency and accountability.

We urge you to ensure that resources for the International Affairs Budget keep pace with the growing global threats and opportunities we face. Now is not the time to retreat.

cc: Secretary of State Rex Tillerson.

cc: Secretary of Defense James Mattis.

cc: National Security Advisor H.R. McMaster.

Signed by a combined 121 retired admirals, generals, and other former military members.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, my colleague from Vermont, Senator BERNIE SANDERS, wrote what I feel was a terrific op-ed about why we should not and do not need to close down the government, why we can do our work and why we should, and that people rely on us, too.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the op-ed be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 8, 2018]

IT'S ON REPUBLICANS TO STOP A SHUTDOWN

(By Bernie Sanders)

I do not know why President Trump and the Republican Party—which controls the White House, the Senate and the House—are so willing to shut down the government. Maybe they think it will be good for them politically. Maybe they believe the chaos created by a government shutdown would be a welcome distraction from the ongoing Russia investigation being conducted by special counsel Robert S. Mueller III. Whatever the motives of the Republican leadership, one thing is clear: A government shutdown would be disastrous for the American people.

A shutdown would harm tens of millions of working-class families who would be unable to access vital services. It would disrupt the lives of hundreds of thousands of federal employees who would not receive the paychecks they expected. It would endanger members of the U.S. military who are putting their lives on the line defending our nation.

Congress has a responsibility to the American people to prevent a shutdown and work in a bipartisan manner to reach a fair budget agreement that addresses the very serious problems facing the working people of our country.

Unfortunately, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R–Ky.) ratcheted up threats of a government shutdown last week by insisting on ending the long-standing, bipartisan agreement over parity for defense and non-defense spending. This principle of parity is enormously important for working families and is something that cannot be terminated. If we do not act, funding for education, child care, health care, nutrition assistance, affordable housing and other important domestic programs will be at a 40-year low as a percentage of our economy.

As the middle class continues to shrink, cuts to non-defense spending would cause even worse economic pain to working families, the elderly, children, the sick and the most vulnerable. Meanwhile, as Trump and the Republicans demand an unbelievable $100 billion increase in military spending over the next two years, the Defense Department has been inoculated from budget cuts over the past several years because of the Overseas Contingency Operations loophole—a special account not subject to spending caps established by Congress in 2011.

Providing parity in these budget negotiations means, among other things, fully funding—without offsets—the Children's Health Insurance Program for 9 million kids and community health centers for 27 million Americans. It means increased funding for the Social Security Administration and the Veterans Administration so they can provide guaranteed benefits to seniors and veterans who have earned them. It means keeping our obligations to more than 1.5 million workers and retirees who are about to lose a large part of the pensions they were promised. It means addressing the crisis of student debt, expanding child care, improving our crumbling infrastructure in rural America and protecting our national parks. It means providing help in the national struggle against opioid and heroin addiction.

Furthermore, as part of the budget negotiations, we must also provide adequate disaster relief to Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, as well as assistance to the Western states recovering from terrible wildfires.

Finally, Trump added even more fuel to the fire when he decided to use 800,000 ''dreamers'' as a bargaining chip for an $18 billion wall that the overwhelming majority of Americans do not want. These dreamers are young people who have lived in this country for almost their entire lives. They go to school. They work. They serve in the U.S. military. The United States is their home; they know no other. For Trump and the Republican leadership to allow their legal status to expire, and to subject them to deportation, would be one of the cruelest acts in modern American history. It must not be allowed to happen.

This is not just my viewpoint. It's what the American people want. A recent Quinnipiac University poll showed that 77 percent of the American people, including a large majority of Republicans, support providing legal protections for the dreamers. The Republican Congress must act. A clean Dream Act must be signed into law as part of any budget agreement.

The American people are increasingly disgusted with a government that protects the interests of the wealthy and the powerful, while ignoring the needs of the vulnerable. The U.S. government must do more than provide huge tax breaks to billionaires, callously deport young people, greatly expand military spending, end net neutrality, deny the reality of climate change and threaten to cut Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, education and nutrition programs. We must pass a budget agreement that addresses the needs of Americans and not just billionaire campaign contributors.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam 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. 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.

TAX REFORM

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, when we were debating the tax relief law at the end of last year, it was a very familiar debate in many ways.

Republicans came to the floor with facts and figures on how much extra money people were going to see in their pockets and their paychecks. Democrats came to the floor with the same old tired line that you always hear them talk about—the millionaires and billionaires.

Republicans pointed out economic studies that showed that workers right now pay more than 70 percent of the cost of corporate taxes. We talked about a study by the Tax Foundation that predicted that if we passed the tax relief bill, the average family would actually see a gain of about $2,600 a year in their after-tax income. It was partly because of getting the tax cut and partly because their employers would then pass on much of the tax cut in higher wages. Democrats didn't believe it. They said that only rich people would benefit and that businesses would never share their tax savings with the workers. The Democratic leader said that ''tax cuts like these benefit the wealthy and the powerful to the exclusion of the middle class.''

Here we are. It is the month after we passed the tax relief bill, the tax reduction bill, and the tax simplification bill, and the question is, Who was right? The very day the tax bill passed in Congress, AT&T came out and said it was giving its workers a bonus. It said that 200,000 hard-working employees were going to get an extra $1,000 each directly because of the new tax relief, tax reduction, tax cut bill. The Tax Foundation predicted that they would eventually get an extra $2,600, and these people are already getting $1,000 each on day one.

That has opened the floodgates to other companies doing the exact same thing and employees around the country experiencing the exact same thing. Businesses started sharing the tax savings with rank-and-file, middle-class workers, and it started on day one—not just the wealthy and the powerful, as Senator SCHUMER has predicted. Over 120 companies have said they are raising wages, giving out bonuses, and investing in their workers because of the tax law. It adds up to over $980 million—$980 million in the pockets of hard-working men and women around the country. How many people are seeing that? By last count, almost 1 million hard-working Americans—over 970,000 hard-working Americans have already gotten the good news.

There is more good news coming every day, with more announcements today. It is exactly what Republicans said would happen. It is happening for people who work at banks, who work at insurance companies, who work at airlines. It is happening for people who work at big companies, such as AT&T, Visa, and Comcast, but it is also happening for people who work at smaller companies, such as a winery in California and an aviation company in Texas. These are businesses and people in communities who are important parts of their communities and doing important jobs. The employees work hard, and now they are getting a share of the relief the Republicans had predicted they would get all along. And they are not just getting cash bonuses. There is a bank in Massachusetts called Berkshire Hills Bancorp. They announced last week that the people working there will be getting a $1,000 bonus and will also see the minimum wage raised to $15 an hour.

More is being invested in employee development and training programs. When you invest more in employee development and training programs, that means people are going to have additional skills that make them even more productive, better at their jobs, and qualify for even higher wages.

This bank in Massachusetts is also contributing an extra $2 million to its charitable efforts, including scholarships. That helps improve the communities where the workers live and where they raise their families.

Democrats said it is not going to happen. It has happened. It is happening every day. They said that businesses would keep the money for themselves. That is not what we are seeing all across the country.

Ms. WARREN, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, went on PBS. The senior Senator from Massachusetts said that the idea that tax relief would lead to higher wages was, in her words, ''the big lie that Republicans have been selling'' for decades. She said that tax relief was ''an insult to working families across America.''

I would point out to Senator WARREN that many of the people who work at this bank are in her home State of Massachusetts. People have gotten wage increases. People have gotten additional money spent on training so they can become more valuable and make even more money. People have seen the minimum wage in that business go up. The workers getting these bonuses and raises in their pay are her constituents. Does she think these people are feeling insulted? Does she believe they have been insulted by getting a $1,000 bonus and getting an increase in their salaries and having investments in terms of additional training? Is that an insult to those people? I don't think so. I bet they are feeling pretty glad to be supported and valued by their employer.

There is another business in Nevada, South Point Casino. Workers there are receiving $1 million total in bonuses. Previously, this business had actually planned to increase the share of health insurance costs that its employees would have to pay because health insurance costs have gone up.

Health insurance prices have skyrocketed ever since ObamaCare was passed. Companies have struggled with how to deal with these rising costs. Many have tried to pass these on to the employees.

This company in Nevada has said that because of the Republican tax relief law, they are canceling their plans to raise insurance costs—canceling their plans to raise the costs. That is more money in employees' pockets. The owner of the business said: ''We want to be sure that our extended family is taken care of.'' That is the way these people think of the people who work for them—as part of their extended family. That is how employers are responding to tax relief all around the country, and that is what we said would happen.

We also predicted that one way businesses might deal with lower taxes would be to cut prices for consumers, let people who use their services or buy their products keep more of their hard-earned money. Americans are starting to see that prediction come true in the form of lower utility bills. Gas, electric, and water utilities across the country are getting ready to cut their rates because the taxes are going down under the law. Customers of the power company in Baltimore are going to receive millions of dollars in the form of lower rates. It has been a cold winter on the east coast, and a lower electric bill is going to be good news for a lot of people in that area. Customers are also likely to see the same thing in Missouri, South Carolina, and Louisiana.

These are the kinds of effects we are seeing all across the country, in various ways. It is all good news for consumers, all good news for people at home as a result of the tax reduction, tax relief, tax cuts passed by Republicans and signed by President Trump.

Americans are getting the benefits of tax relief. They are getting the benefit of regulatory relief and the pro-growth policies of Republicans in Congress and the Trump administration. People are seeing it in their daily lives. The polling company Gallup said that as soon as Donald Trump was elected President, economic confidence in this country soared. That is what the polls found. It has stayed positive almost without interruption ever since. It is the exact opposite of what polls were showing during the previous 8 years, in the previous administration. That was during the so-called economic recovery.

Why are people so optimistic now? It is because you can't open a newspaper or turn on a television without seeing more good news about the economy. New employment numbers came out last Friday. CNN had a headline: ''U.S.

economy added 2 million jobs in 2017.'' The Washington Post's headline was ''Trump's first-year jobs numbers were very, very good.'' Bloomberg reported that the Christmas shopping season was ''probably the best one in a decade.'' People are feeling confident. They are seeing higher wages, they are seeing cash bonuses, and soon they will start seeing the tax cut in their paychecks.

The American people know that Republicans have kept our promise. We are cutting regulations, cutting taxes, putting more money back in their pockets. That is what hard-working Americans have asked us to do, and that is what we are going to continue to do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the positive impact the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will have on Iowa farmers.

Of course, our Iowa agricultural economy is really important, and those men and women who are serving as farmers, ranchers, and growers in the State of Iowa mean the world to me, coming from a farm my family had in Southwest Iowa.

We all understand this has been a very challenging time for farmers in our rural communities. The community I come from in Southwest Iowa has just 10,000 people in our county. Many of them have faced the challenges of the economic downturn. Since their peaks in 2012, corn prices have declined by 60 percent and soybean prices have declined by 47 percent. My neighbors are hurting, folks. Farm income has nearly been cut in half since 2013.

A lot of our producers are hurting, especially our young and beginning farmers who have gotten their start just in maybe the last 10 years or so, but, fortunately for our farmers, our ranchers, and our growers, tax relief is on its way. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will provide sweeping tax cuts for farmers and rural communities, allowing our producers to keep more of those hard-earned dollars.

About 95 percent of farms are organized as passthrough businesses, such as sole proprietorships, partnerships, and S corps. These businesses are taxed under individual tax rules and will benefit from lower tax rates for every income bracket. On top of that, they will see significant relief through a new 20-percent deduction on passthrough business income. The law also provides relief from the costly individual mandate which forced many farmers to choose between buying an expensive ObamaCare plan through their State exchange or being fined.

Now, just a couple of years ago, I remember a very intense conversation I had with a beginning farmer in Northeast Iowa. When he was purchasing his insurance through the State exchange, the cost had more than doubled. He was shaking he was so upset about it, and he explained to me the additional cost of that individual policy was his truck payment. There was no room in his budget for the additional cost of that insurance policy so he had to make that choice: Do I purchase through the individual exchange or do I make my truck payment? Fortunately, within this bill, we have that relief. He can make that choice, and the choice is his on whether he makes that truck payment and forgoes the insurance or whether now he can do without that type of insurance and not be fined because he was too poor to afford it.

In addition, the bill dramatically expands section 179 expensing and allows 5 years of 100 bonus depreciation. Both of these changes will foster much needed investment in farms throughout Iowa.

The law also preserves a number of important tax provisions for farmers, including the interest deduction, cash accounting, and the use of like-kind exchanges for property.

Last, but certainly not least, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act doubles the Federal estate tax exemption while preserving the stepped-up basis. The death tax can have a devastating impact on family farms. Over 90 percent of farm assets cannot be sold easily without losing value. Especially as we continue to experience a downturn in that ag economy, family farmers are sometimes left with no choice but to sell land or the equipment they use to farm that land when they are forced to pay that tax.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is a big step in the right direction for agriculture. I am thankful to the President for his leadership and to my colleagues in the Senate and the House for helping get this long-needed bill done. On behalf of agriculture, thank you.

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. BOOZMAN. 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. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to highlight the positive impacts our historic tax reform law will have on the agricultural community.

Agriculture is Arkansas' largest industry by far, adding $16 billion to our economy every year and accounting for approximately one in every six jobs. We are the top rice-producing State in the Nation, No. 2 in the Nation in broiler chicken production, and the third largest producer of catfish in the United States. We could also clothe and shelter ourselves from fiber grown in Arkansas, as we are the third in the Nation in cotton production and the fifth largest softwood lumber-producing State. You could keep going down the list, and you would find Arkansas as one of the Nation's top 10 producers of a number of agricultural commodities.

Clearly, ensuring that Washington helps create an economic environment that allows the agricultural industry to thrive is extremely important to my home State of Arkansas. When President Trump signed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act into law, his signature provided much needed tax relief to America's farmers. More than 94 percent of farms are organized as passthrough businesses, which means they are impacted by the same tax provisions as individual filers. Lower tax rates across the board and a 20-percent deduction from their taxable income means immediate savings, which can be reinvested to help grow their operations.

Ninety seven percent of the farms in Arkansas are family owned, and the vast majority of them will now be exempt from the estate tax—the death tax. This is a big deal. It will help keep those farms and ranches in the family for generations to come.

Finally, farmers and ranchers will be able to expense 100 percent of their capital investments, such as equipment, over the next 4 years. In his address to the Farm Bureau earlier this week, the President called this the ''sleeper'' in the bill. He is right. People don't realize and there hasn't been enough talk about how beneficial this provision will be for our family-run agricultural operations. The substance of the President's Farm Bureau speech tilted heavily toward our efforts to bring stability and predictability to the economy.

As we have witnessed over the course of the previous administration, uncertainty is devastating to our economy. There are few industries that are inherently more affected by uncertainty than agriculture. This is why we have taken steps to eliminate some of the punitive, needless regulations that create uncertainty for our farmers and our ranchers.

It is also why my colleagues and I on the Agriculture Committee, under the steadfast leadership of Chairman ROBERTS, are working hard to reauthorize the farm bill. Programs are authorized by the farm bill that are absolutely vital to farmers, ranchers, and consumers. These programs will provide more certainty in rural America to address the challenges ahead. Finally, it is why we took great care to ensure that the agricultural industry will see the benefits of tax reform. Establishing a tax code that works for our farmers and ranchers, as opposed to against them, is vital to their ability to plan for the future and invigorate our rural communities.

I am proud of our efforts to pass this landmark tax reform law, and I am

confident it will have lasting, positive effects for our economy.

With that, I yield back.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL BROWN

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I am honored and privileged to come to the floor of the Senate today to talk about Michael Brown, appointed by President Donald Trump to be a district judge on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia.

Mr. Brown is an outstanding citizen of our State. He is married to a wonderful lady and has three wonderful children. He is a graduate of Marist School, a graduate of Georgetown University, and a graduate of the University of Georgia Law School, magna cum laude, in 1994.

He has a record of practicing law in the private sector that is unparalleled, having worked for both King & Spalding and also Alston & Bird.

King & Spalding produced many of the judges on the bench of the United States of America with distinguished records, not the least of which is the Attorney General under President Jimmy Carter, Griffin Bell, an outstanding Attorney General from our State. They also produced Sam Nunn, an outstanding Member of the Senate. They produced many judges in our State. Many were also produced from the firm where he practices now, which is Alston & Bird.

It is a privilege for me to talk about Michael for many reasons. Most importantly, he comes with a background of experience in the private sector. He has been recommended by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce as one of the great lawyers in the United States of America in business matters. One of the things our courts need is a tempered balance of business and consumers. There is no question that someone who is not a voice for business as a judge but has experience in business as a judge will make a tremendous difference. I know he will in the Northern District of Georgia.

I thank the President for nominating Michael and making this appointment. To the Members of the Senate, I urge you to join me in voting for Michael Brown for the Northern District of Georgia to be our next judge there. He will be a great judge on the bench. It will be a great decision for us, and it will continue the growth and improvement of outstanding jurists confirmed by this Senate in this year 2018.

I yield back.

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. BURR. 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. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to begin the series of votes.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Parker nomination?

Mr. BURR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 5 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Gardner	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blumenthal	Harris	Portman
Blunt	Hassan	Reed
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Brown	Heinrich	Roberts
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cantwell	Heller	Rubio
Capito	Hirono	Sanders
Cardin	Hoeven	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Schatz
Casey	Isakson	Schumer
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott
Cochran	Jones	Shaheen
Collins	Kaine	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Smith
Corker	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Leahy	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Enzi	Merkley	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	Young
Flake	Murray	

NOT VOTING—2

Booker	McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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 bill 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 nomination of Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Mitch McConnell, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, John Thune, Roger F. Wicker, James M. Inhofe, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Todd Young.

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 nomination of Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 97, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blumenthal	Harris	Reed
Blunt	Hassan	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Brown	Heinrich	Rounds
Burr	Heitkamp	Rubio
Cantwell	Heller	Sanders
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Cardin	Inhofe	Schatz
Carper	Isakson	Schumer
Casey	Johnson	Scott
Cassidy	Jones	Shaheen
Cochran	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Smith
Coons	King	Stabenow
Corker	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Tester
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	Markey	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	Young
Fischer	Murray	
Flake	Nelson	

NAYS—1

Hirono

NOT VOTING—2

Booker	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 97, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the Trump administration has come up with a name for its energy policy. The energy policy amounts to, basically, a big, fat cascade of gifts and special favors for oil, gas, and coal companies, which, in turn, make big political contributions. Trump officials call the policy ''energy dominance.'' More accurately, its name would probably be ''fossil fuel industry political dominance'' or one might actually call it ''ignorance dominance'' since the administration willfully ignores scientific understanding, basic economics, market theory, and even the warnings of our national security community.

The situation is not pretty from an environmental point of view. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt is busily trying to roll back rules that limit, for instance, emissions of methane, which is a more powerful greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. He is considering walking back fuel efficiency standards that save drivers money at the pump. President Trump withdrew the United States from the Paris climate accord and was promptly ignored by every other nation on Earth.

Last month, on the Interior Secretary's recommendation, Trump took big areas of the Bears Ears and Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monuments, in Utah, away from the public and opened them, instead, to big mining and oil and gas interests. Zinke has even proposed to open almost all U.S. coastlines to drilling by oil and gas companies. That includes drilling in protected areas in the Arctic, drilling up and down the Atlantic coast, expanded drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, and drilling along the Pacific coastline. The plan even includes Georges Bank and other crucial fishing grounds for New England.

This drilling scheme is likely dead on arrival. Republican Governors in New Jersey, Maryland, and Florida have all denounced the plan, as have Florida's Democratic and Republican Senators. It even runs into objections from the Pentagon. When President Obama considered opening the southern Atlantic coast to drilling 2 years ago, the Defense Department told the Obama administration that offshore energy development could interfere with military readiness and missile testing.

Given the dominance of fossil fuel political interests in this administration, the whole Trump energy dominance scheme, of course, neglects the warnings of our national security experts about climate change—climate change as an accelerant of global instability and conflict and climate change as a direct hazard to military installations and infrastructure, from the Naval Station Norfolk to faraway facilities like Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

In 2008, the National Intelligence Council reported more than 30 U.S. military installations facing risk from rising sea levels. A vulnerability assessment directed by the ''2010 Quadrennial Defense Review'' found that at around 3 feet of sea level rise, 128 military installations are at risk. Naturally, many of those belong to the Navy—indeed, 56 out of those 128. It is a significant share of the Navy's global footprint, totaling around $100 billion in value.

In 2011, the National Academy of Sciences report, ''National Security Implications of Climate Change for U.S. Naval Forces,'' recommended the continued review of how sea level rise and changes in storm frequency and intensity would affect coastal installations.

The National Defense Authorization Act, which we just passed, directs the Department of Defense to study how climate change will affect our most vulnerable military bases over the next 20 years, including ''the effects of rising sea tides, increased flooding, drought, desertification, wildfires, thawing permafrost,'' as well as how climate change may drive new requirements for combatant commanders.

The law includes a sense of Congress statement that ''climate change is a direct threat to the national security of the United States and is impacting stability in areas of the world both where the United States Armed Forces are operating today, and where strategic implications for future conflict exist.''

That is a sense-of-Congress statement that has passed this Republican-controlled Senate and the Republican-controlled House and was signed into law by this administration. Thank you to the author of this language, my friend and fellow Rhode Islander, Congressman JIM LANGEVIN.

Even the U.S. Government Accountability Office has engaged. The independent oversight agency issued a report titled, ''Climate Change Adaptation: DoD Needs to Better Incorporate Adaptation into Planning and Collaboration at Overseas Installations.''

I think that title gives away the punch line. Surveying our bases and installations across the world, GAO found that weather and climate change pose operational and budgetary risks to infrastructure. GAO recommended that DOD's climate planning efforts be expanded and increased; specifically, that the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force require defense installations to ''systematically track the costs associated with extreme weather events and climate change'' and that DOD better coordinate addressing climate change risks across different DOD installations.

This picture in the GAO report shows an unnamed military facility in the Pacific that has at times been cut off by flooding from access points to its munitions storage complex. If you have a military facility that can't get access to its munitions storage, you have a problem.

This is the picture of the flooded entryway, and this is the picture of the similar entryway under normal circumstances, able to be traveled.

A 2014 typhoon caused flash flooding here that trapped and imperiled American personnel. The point is, when climate change effects inhibit military base operations, defense preparedness requires climate preparedness.

Naval Station Norfolk, the largest Navy base in the world, is a poster child for the devastation that awaits our coastal military bases if we continue to pump out the greenhouse gas emissions that are driving sea level rise. A tide gauge operated at the base since 1927 has shown nearly 15 inches of vertical sea level rise so far. In the broader Hampton Roads metro area, home not only to the Navy but also to facilities of the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, NASA, and NOAA, high tides are already regularly forcing seawater back through storm drains and flooding roadways.

DOD's own environmental research program, the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, used Norfolk as its case study for sea level rise and extreme storm risks to coastal DOD installations. The study found a ''tipping point'' of about a half meter, 1.6 feet, of sea level rise, at which point ''the probabilities of damage to infrastructure and losses in mission performance increased dramatically.'' This is mapping of the flood hazard around Naval Station Norfolk.

This tipping point at which the mission performance losses increase dramatically is only a few decades away. Retired RADM David Titley, a former oceanographer and navigator of the Navy and leader of its Climate Change Task Force, said Norfolk has about 10 to 15 years to get serious about sea level rise in the region before ''we're really cutting it close.''

In 2017, CAPT Dean Vanderley, who leads infrastructure engineering at the Norfolk Naval base, admitted that sea level rise is ''something where I don't know that we've fully defined the problem. And we have definitely not fully defined the solution.''

Retired CAPT Joe Bouchard, a former base commander, told InsideClimate News that Naval Station Norfolk would need significant improvements to nearly every piece of infrastructure, from electrical and drainage systems to pier improvements, not to mention a seawall. He estimated this work could cost more than $1 billion and take as long as a decade to complete. That is just one base with $1 billion and a decade's worth of work. The DOD has identified over 128 bases that would be at significant risk with 3 feet of sea level rise. I think NOAA's current estimate is for 6 feet of global sea rise by the end of the century.

Even though our President is clueless about the basics of climate change, his Secretary of Defense understands and acknowledges the risks. In response to congressional questioning last year, Secretary Mattis said, ''Climate change is impacting stability in areas of the world where our troops are operating today. . . . It is appropriate for the Combatant Commands to incorporate drivers of instability that impact the security environment in their areas into their planning.''

Well, for political reasons, the White House can't acknowledge the problem so the recently published ''National Security Strategy'' totally disregards all of these recommendations. It will not even mention the forbidden words. We know these words are forbidden in the Trump administration because over and over again the memos leak out about people being told don't say the words ''climate change.''

Instead, with all these warnings from GAO, from senior military officials, from the National Intelligence Council, from a decade of Quadrennial Defense Reviews, and the testimony of Secretary Mattis—instead of listening to that, Trump parrots climate change denial talking points that come from the phony fossil fuel front groups. It is pathetic. Calling this deliberate ignorance ''energy dominance'' may be a fine fossil fuel flourish, but it is completely disconnected from actual safety, security, and military readiness—and don't get me started on what the fossil fuel industry's systematic corruption of our democracy means for America's fabled status as that ''city on a hill.''

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

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

IRAN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss my thoughts on recent protests in Iran and the important upcoming decisions by the President with respect to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the JCPOA.

While I am mindful that we have limited visibility into Iran and continue to learn more about the circumstances and motivations of the recent protests, one thing is clear: A significant portion of the Iranian people are not satisfied with their government and are increasingly willing to make their dissatisfaction heard. It is important that we support their right to peacefully express their views and demand that the Iranian Government respond with constructive dialogue, rather than force.

It was notable that Iranian President Ruhani implicitly recognized the validity of the protests earlier this week when he reportedly said:

> It would be a misrepresentation and also an insult to Iranian people to say they only had economic demands. . . . People had economic, political and social demands

That is according to President Ruhani.

Acknowledging the need for reform, Ruhani continued:

> We cannot pick a lifestyle and tell two generations after us to live like that. It is impossible. The views of the young generation about life and the world is different than ours.

Now is the time to support the Iranian people in their quest for a government that is more representative and supportive of their interests. Unfortunately, some have suggested that our response should be to withdraw from the JCPOA, an action that I believe would only serve to embolden the hardliners in Iran and leave the United States more isolated from our allies. Withdrawing from the JCPOA and reimposing nuclear-related sanctions on Iran would immediately change the narrative inside of Iran, uniting reformists and hardliners alike in their opposition to what they view as a hostile United States.

While some would argue that the recent protests in Iran are symptomatic of what they view as a flawed JCPOA, I would suggest otherwise. In reality, the nuclear deal exposed one of the Iranian regime's central vulnerabilities—namely, that the regime can no longer simply blame sanctions imposed by the United States and the international community for its economic woes at home. It is becoming clearer to the Iranian people that it is actually the regime's corruption, financial mismanagement, funding of malign activities, and hegemonic ambitions that are at the root of their government's inability to enable job creation and to ensure that necessities like food and gasoline remain affordable.

In the coming days, the President has several important decisions to make with respect to the JCPOA. In October, President Trump acknowledged that Iran is meeting its commitments under the JCPOA, but he chose not to certify that continued sanctions relief is ''appropriate and proportionate'' to the actions taken by Iran with respect to terminating its illicit nuclear program. By the end of this week, President Trump is again required to decide whether to issue such a certification. I expect he will again choose not to do so.

The more consequential decision for the President this week will be whether to continue waivers of nuclear-related sanctions, as he is required to do under the JCPOA. Choosing not to continue such waivers would immediately snap back U.S. nuclear-related sanctions, thereby putting the United States in violation of the JCPOA. Let me be clear. This would be a unilateral action on behalf of the United States that would put us in violation of an international agreement, not just with Iran but with the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China, as well.

By all accounts, the JCPOA is working as intended, and Iran is verifiably meeting its commitments under the deal. It is important to remember what the JCPOA was designed to do and what it is now achieving. The JCPOA commits Iran to never seeking to develop or acquire a nuclear weapon; effectively cuts off all pathways for Iran to achieve a nuclear weapon during the period covered by the agreement; and increases the time it would take for Iran to acquire enough material for one nuclear bomb from 2 to 3 months to at least 1 year. When this agreement was signed, they were within months of having that capability. It dramatically reduces Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium and the number of installed centrifuges. It has prevented Iran from producing weapons-grade plutonium and has subjected Iran to robust monitoring by the IAEA to verify its compliance.

Withdrawing from the JCPOA at this point would provide no benefit and would actually leave us more isolated and less able to deal with the various challenges posed by Iran. The crippling sanctions regime that brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place only worked because the international community was united in its determination to keep Iran from achieving a nuclear weapon. If we withdraw from the JCPOA unilaterally—and in the absence of a clear violation of the deal by Iran—there is no reason to believe that our partners in the P5+1 would join us. In fact, French President Macron has said that there is ''no alternative'' to the JCPOA and told the U.N. General Assembly that ''renouncing it would be a grave error.''

General Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the Armed Services Committee last year:

> I believe that the U.S. would incur damage vis-a-vis our allies if we unilaterally withdraw from the JCPOA. Our allies will be less likely to cooperate with us on future military action to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and less likely to cooperate with us on countering other destabilizing aspects of Iranian behavior that threaten our collective interests.

Our sanctions may snap back but not those imposed by the rest of the world, many of whom have begun building economic ties to Iran since the JCPOA was signed. Our international partners would then blame us, not Iran, for the failure of the deal.

Some, including President Trump, have argued that we can and should dissolve the JCPOA and renegotiate a better deal. This is a highly unrealistic proposal. We were only able to achieve the JCPOA after years of sustained multilateral diplomatic efforts and the imposition of aggressive international sanctions in concert with our partners. It will likely be impossible to replicate those conditions if the United States unilaterally withdraws from the JCPOA.

Contrary to President Trump's belief, threatening to walk away from the

deal actually weakens our ability to address the JCPOA's perceived flaws by alienating our partners. Instead, we should remain committed to the JCPOA and lead the international community in imposing additional sanctions, where necessary, to change other Iranian behaviors—namely, their respect for human rights, ballistic missile development efforts, and other malign activities.

We must also seek to help enable the Iranian people to make their choices heard, including by encouraging the adoption of social media and other means of communication. We could start by building upon general licenses issued by the Obama administration designed to encourage the export of communications technology to Iran.

Secretary Mattis told the Armed Services Committee at his confirmation hearing: ''When America gives her word, we have to live up to it and work with our allies.''

If the President decides this week not to continue nuclear-related sanctions relief for Iran, he will be effectively choosing to restart the Iranian nuclear program, thereby making military conflict with Iran more likely.

Withdrawing from the deal would also be a devastating blow to our efforts toward diplomacy with North Korea—and for that matter, any future diplomatic efforts to constrain aggressive behavior by our adversaries. Why would any nation engage with us in serious dialogue to resolve differences if they fear we will later withdraw unilaterally, even when the other parties are complying with the agreement?

Regardless of whether you supported the JCPOA before it was signed, the truth is that it has removed the greatest threat we faced from Iran while also preserving all other means to address Iran's malign activities. Let there be no doubt—Iran continues to be a state sponsor of terrorism and an abuser of human rights. Iran continues to destabilize the region through its development of ballistic missiles and support of proxies in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, and elsewhere. If Iran behaves this way without a nuclear weapon, imagine how much worse a nuclear-armed Iran would be.

Fortunately, our nonnuclear sanctions on Iran remain in place and are unaffected by the JCPOA. In fact, Congress authorized additional sanctions in July to help deal with these issues. The administration should work with our international partners and use all tools at its disposal, including by ramping up nonnuclear sanctions, where necessary, to counter Iran's unacceptable behavior in these other areas.

Abrogating the JCPOA only invites another nuclear crisis like the one we are currently facing with North Korea—a concern echoed by General Dunford when he appeared before the Armed Services Committee and said: ''It makes sense to me that our holding up agreements that we have signed, unless there's a material breach, would have impact on others' willingness to sign agreements.''

Many have criticized the JCPOA as a ''flawed deal.'' For example, concerns have been raised that certain provisions sunset after a period of years, thereby delaying rather than permanently preventing Iran from achieving a nuclear weapon. If the concern is that Iran may seek to resume nuclear weapons development activities after these sunsets—a concern that I share—the appropriate course of action is not to throw out the deal but to work with our international partners to ensure that necessary restrictions on the JCPOA are appropriately extended or supplemented.

As I noted before, Iran has committed in perpetuity not to develop or seek to acquire nuclear weapons. We should not take them at their word; we should verify their adherence to this commitment, just as we are doing under the JCPOA. If at any point in the future we have evidence to suggest Iran is taking steps that would indicate a violation of that commitment, we should use that information to rally the P5+1 and other international partners to take a unified stand against such efforts. Unilaterally withdrawing from the JCPOA would seriously damage our ability to exert such leadership in the future.

Again, according to General Dunford, in the absence of the JCPOA, Iran would likely resume its nuclear weapons program and ''a nuclear-armed Iran would likely be more aggressive in its actions and more dangerous in its consequences.'' General Dunford also told the committee that ''the intel community assessment is, in fact, that Iran is in compliance right now [with the JCPOA], and therefore, I think we should focus on addressing the other challenges: the missile threat they pose, the maritime threat they pose, the support of proxies, terrorists, and the cyber threat they pose.'' I wholeheartedly agree with General Dunford's assessment.

Our troops in Iraq and Syria are operating in close proximity to Iranian-aligned militias, including those who previously targeted American troops. Unilaterally withdrawing from the JCPOA could embolden these hardline militias and possibly result in Iran giving them a green light to begin targeting U.S. forces once more.

Furthermore, while I have full confidence in our military's ability to fight and win wars when necessary, we cannot escape the reality that military contingencies to respond to both a nuclear-armed North Korea and Iran would result in massive loss of life and national treasure and greatly stress our military's capacity and capabilities.

In conclusion, I will return to where I began. Now is not the time to impose a self-inflicted wound upon our foreign policy and standing in the world. Unilaterally withdrawing from the JCPOA would empower Iranian hardliners and dramatically undermine the reform-minded protests we should be seeking to empower. Worse still, it would leave us more isolated in the international community and, by extension, less able to address the range of national security challenges posed by Iran, North Korea, and our other potential adversaries.

We must not abdicate the JCPOA or American leadership on these issues. Therefore, I urge the President to stay the course with respect to the JCPOA, while also rallying the international community to take effective actions intended to change other unacceptable behaviors by the Iranian regime to suppress dissent at home and sow instability abroad. We must not squander this opportunity by making the story about the United States rather than the courageous Iranians who at great risk to themselves have taken to the streets to demand a better future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon tomorrow, all postcloture time on the Brown nomination be considered expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the Brown nomination with no intervening action or debate; further, that if cloture is invoked on the Counts nomination, all postcloture time be considered expired at 1:45 p.m. tomorrow and the Senate vote on confirmation of the Counts nomination with no intervening action or debate; finally, that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider with respect to the Brown and Counts nominations be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for about 20 years now, I have viewed the development and deployment of a layered ballistic missile defense shield as probably singularly the most vital thing we could be doing around here. People are aware of that now. Adversaries, like North Korea and others, have ballistic missiles, and they are increasing their range capability. Iran is getting almost everything. One of the problems you have is that you get countries like North Korea developing missile capabilities, and if they have it, then other adversaries have it. I am talking about Yemen and all the rest of them.

It is important for us to communicate to the American people that the

threat we face is probably the most imminent threat we have had in the history of this country. Today, it is the greatest threat we have had certainly in my lifetime.

I have come to the floor and spoken on this issue in 2001, 2009, 2012, and this will be the fourth time this year. Over the last 30 years, we have witnessed the missile defense programs go through dramatic investment periods, followed by extreme starvation and cancellations—I am talking about in the United States—depending on who happens to be President at the time.

Remember, of course, when Reagan came in and people made fun of him with ''Star Wars'' and tried to defame him in any way they could. Yet he was able to be persistent and start a program, and we should be very thankful we have it today. That was followed in 1989 by President Bush. He continued that program.

However, in 1993, when President Clinton was in office, the first thing he did was to cut $2.5 billion out of the Bush missile defense budget request for fiscal year 1994. He also terminated the Reagan-Bush Strategic Defense Initiative and downgraded the National Missile Defense Program to a research and development program. He cut 5-year missile defense funding by 54 percent, from $39 billion to $18 billion.

I say this because these times are changing. Continuing with his administration in 1996, he cut the funding and slowed down the development of THAAD and the Navy Theater Wide Systems. To remind ourselves of how important that was at that time and the cuts he made to that and how critical that was, THAAD right now is the only thing we have to join forces with South Korea to be able to knock down something coming from North Korea to South Korea. The Aegis system is a defensive system that we could share with Japan. Without these systems, they would be wide open. That was 1996.

In 1999, the last of the Clinton years, he delayed by at least 2 years the Space Based Infrared System, which is a very complicated system that knocks down incoming missiles. Then, in 2000, Bush came in. By the end of 2008, President Bush had succeeded in fielding a missile defense system capable of defending all 50 States. One of the things he did that was most significant—and this is in the final years of his administration—was to recognize the fact that we have had ground-based interceptors in our country for a number of years. In fact, there are 44 ground-based interceptor systems. Unfortunately, they are all on the west coast because that is where we thought the threat would be. We discovered at that time, during the Bush administration, that the threat was from both sides because we recognized that Iran was developing the capabilities, as well as North Korea and others. So in order to protect Eastern United States as well as Central Europe, we had the system that was set up. It was kind of funny because I remember being there with one of our strongest allies. The system they set up was one where they had a radar system in the Czech Republic, and they had a rocket system—a ground-based interceptor—in Poland, right next door. I remember when Vaclav Klaus was the President of the Czech Republic, one of our strongest supporters, and he said to me at that time: Now, if we go ahead and put our system in the Czech Republic and in Poland, can you assure me that if we incur the wrath of Russia, we are not going to end up being embarrassed and have the rug pulled out from under us?

I said: There is not a chance in the world that would happen.

Well, that did happen. In fact, it was a total of 44 ground-based interceptors that were fielded. That was in Alaska and California, on the west coast. We went through this where they pulled the rug out from under Poland, as well as the Czech Republic. Then, in April, came our first Obama defense cuts, which began disarming America and dismantling our layered missile defense system. This is critical because we put this in for the reason that we perceived the threat to be coming in from the east as opposed to the west coast, and the very system that would have protected us was taken down by President Obama.

I would say, due to his overall reduced budget requests in defense, there were not enough Aegis ships. I already mentioned how we are using those today in defense of many of our allies, including Japan. Since Kim Jong Un took power in 2009, he has already conducted more than 80 ballistic missile tests. That is far more than his father and his grandfather conducted.

North Korea has conducted six nuclear tests of increasingly powerful weapons. The latest test was in September of last year. The major test actually came after that, and that was on November 28. On November 28, he demonstrated that he had the range of the United States and the central part of our country. In other words, it was stated by others who observed that he now has the capability of reaching any target in mainland United States.

There were some scientists who did an analysis of what they did on November 28. They made it very clear. David Wright, an analyst for the Union of Concerned Scientists, wrote that—this is something that happened on November 29—that yesterday's test indicates that North Korea can now hold the United States well within missile range. He said: ''Such a missile would have been more than enough range to reach Washington, DC, and in fact any other part of the continental United States.''

Here is the scary part of this. Those who are not wanting to believe that the threat is real and the threat is there are saying: Well, we don't know that the missile he demonstrated on November 28 could have reached that range if it had a full payload, a load of a nuclear warhead.

We don't know if they had one or not, but that doesn't give me much comfort. They also questioned whether or not it could sustain the reentry back into the atmosphere.

The point is that they now have that capability, and that is something we have to keep in mind as we are making decisions, because we have decisions to make, and that is what we are doing right now in trying to decide how we are going to keep the government from shutting down and develop some kind of a budget plan that is going to serve us well.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, let me mention something else that I think is very significant because I heard today a lot of people criticizing and not really understanding what happened with the tax plan that was passed. We are already getting the results of it. It is kind of exciting. I don't recall anything in my career where we got the results as quickly as we got and we are getting right now. We heard Minority Leader SCHUMER call the tax plan ''a punch in the gut to the middle class.'' In an op-ed piece in the New York Times, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN and Senator BERNIE SANDERS said: ''The Republican agenda on health care and taxes is . . . widely disliked by the American people'' and a ''tax giveaway to the wealthy.''

I think it is important that people understand that not only is middle-class America going to benefit from this, but they already have. One million Americans are counting on receiving raises and bonuses from this tax reform. In my State of Oklahoma, thousands of employees will be receiving and have already received large compensation increases, bonuses—Express Employment Professionals in Oklahoma City, American Airlines, Southwest Airlines, and AT&T. In fact, Senator ROY BLUNT was coming back on a plane, the same one I was on, and the flight attendant was talking about how she had already received a $1,000 bonus. Then, the rest of them chimed in and said: We have too.

That is already happening. Right now we have a list of 123 major corporations that have already given an average of $1,000 for every employee they have, predicated on the assumption that the tax plan is going to increase the economy, and that is exactly what is going to happen.

I am confident that this is actually happening today. I have to say this, though, because more people still try to say: Well, we can't give tax reductions to people and still increase revenue to do all of these things we need to do with our national defense and with our infrastructure programs.

That is not true.

I am going to repeat one that I have done before on this, but people seem to not understand. It is easy to say: Well, if you reduce taxes, you are going to reduce revenue.

That is not the way it works. I remember very well what happened. I was not in this position, of course, but in 1991, when Ronald Reagan was President, at that time he had the most far-reaching reduction in taxes. Remember, the top rate was reduced from 70 percent to 30 percent, and the other brackets came down proportionately. Yet at the time he did that, in 1981, the total amount of revenue coming into the United States was $469 billion. As a result of that, it increased revenue to $750 billion. That is huge, and it shows that it really happens. The reason it happens is that for each 1-percent increase in the economy, it produces increased revenue of some $3 trillion. That is what happened then, and that is what is going to happen now. People are rejoicing today.

I ask unanimous consent that a sheet that outlines all of these companies that are giving large bonuses as a result of the tax bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPANIES INCREASING COMPENSATION, SO FAR

1. AAON
2. AT&T
3. AccuWeather
4. Advance Financial
5. Aflac
6. Alaska Air Group
7. American Airlines
8. American Bank
9. American Savings Bank
10. Americollect
11. Aquesta Financial Holdings
12. Associated Bank
13. Atlas Air Worldwide
14. Ball Ventures
15. Bancorp South
16. Bank of America
17. Bank of Colorado
18. Bank of Hawaii
19. Bank of the James
20. Bank of the Ozarks
21. Berkshire Hills Bancorp
22. BB&T
23. Carl Black Automotive Group
24. Central Bancompany, Inc.
25. Central Pacific Bank
26. Charlie Bravo Aviation
27. Charlotte Pipe and Foundry
28. Citizens Financial Group
29. Colling Pest Solutions
30. Comcast
31. Comerica Bank
32. Commerce Bank
33. Community Trust Bancorp
34. Copperleaf Assisted Living
35. Cornerstone Holdings
36. Dayton T. Brown Inc.
37. Delaware Supermarkets Inc.
38. DePatco, Inc.
39. Dime Community Bancshares
40. Eagle Ridge Ranch
41. EastIdahoNews.com
42. Elite Roofing Systems (Idaho)
43. Elite Clinical Trials, Inc.
44. Emkay, Inc.
45. Ennis, Inc.
46. Express Employment Prof.
47. Fifth Third Bancorp
48. FirstCapital Bank of Texas
49. First Farmers Bank & Trust
50. First Financial Northwest, Inc.
51. First Hawaiian Bank
52. First Horizon National Corp.
53. Flemington Car & Truck
54. Fort Ranch
55. Gardner Company
56. Gate City Bank
57. GetFoundFirst.com
58. Great Southern Bancorp
59. HarborOne Bank
60. Hartford Financial Services
61. Hawaii National Bank
62. IAT Insurance Group
63. INB Bank
64. InUnison Inc.
65. JetBlue
66. Jordan Winery
67. Kansas City Southern
68. Kauai Cattle
69. Melaleuca
70. Mid-AM Metal Forming
71. Move It Or Lose It Moving
72. National Bank Holdings Corp.
73. Nationwide Insurance
74. National Guardian
75. Navient
76. Nelnet
77. Nephron Pharmaceuticals
78. Northpoint Apartments
79. OceanFirst Financial
80. Ohnward Bancshares
81. Old Dominion Freight Line
82. Pinnacle Bank
83. Pioneer Credit Recovery
84. PNC Financial Services
85. Regions Financial
86. Renasant Bank
87. Resident Construction
88. Riverbend Communications
89. Riverbend Management, Inc.
90. Riverbend Ranch
91. Riverbend Services
92. Rush Enterprises
93. Sheffer Corporation
94. Sinclair Broadcast Group
95. Smith Chevrolet
96. Smith Honda
97. Smith RV
98. South Point Casino
99. Southwest Airlines
100. Steel Design
101. Stifel Financial Corp.
102. Summit State Bank
103. SunTrust Banks, Inc.
104. TCF Financial Corp.
105. The Flood Insurance Agency
106. The Travelers Companies
107. Territorial Savings Bank
108. Texas Capital Bank
109. Tokio Marine HCC
110. Total System Services
111. Turning Point Brands
112. Unity Bank
113. U.S. Bancorp
114. Visa
115. Washington Federal
116. Webster Financial
117. Wells Fargo
118. Western Alliance Bancorp
119. Western & Southern Financial
120. Willow Creek Woodworks
121. Windsor Federal Savings
122. Yancey Bros.
123. Zions Bancorp

TAX RELIEF PAYS AMERICAN WORKERS

Almost immediately after Congress passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, American workers at dozens of firms began to see the effects in the form of bonuses and raises. For supporters of tax relief this was good news, though not altogether a surprise. During debate over the law, economists cited research that workers bear most of the burden of the corporate income tax via reduced wages. The remainder is borne by consumers and investors. A significant cut in the corporate rate would provide real benefits to workers.

One study by scholars at the American Enterprise Institute concluded that a 1 percent increase in the corporate tax rate is associated with a 0.5 percent decrease in real wages. A 2007 Treasury Department survey of economic studies found that workers ''bear a substantial burden'' of the corporate income tax. The Congressional Budget Office concluded in 2006 that workers pay more than 70 percent of the cost of corporate taxes.

Opponents of tax relief countered that a corporate rate cut would help only the wealthy—a claim being knocked down more each day. Minority Leader Chuck Schumer said that ''history shows tax cuts like these benefit the wealthy and the powerful to the exclusion of the middle class.'' As a wave of companies across the country began announcing bonuses and giving raises to workers, it became clear that tax relief is putting more money in the pockets of the hard-working Americans who Republicans said would win because of the law.

The same day the House and Senate passed the bill, December 20, AT&T Inc. issued a press release saying: ''Once tax reform is signed into law, AT&T plans to invest an additional $1 billion in the United States in 2018 and pay a special $1,000 bonus to more than 200,000 AT&T U.S. employees—all union-represented, non-management and front-line managers. If the President signs the bill before Christmas, employees will receive the bonus over the holidays.''

So far, at least 123 companies have announced they are giving employees bonuses or otherwise increasing compensation due to the tax cut legislation. Notable examples include:

American Airlines, Southwest Airlines, and JetBlue announced $1,000 bonuses for their employees (a total of more than 200,000 people). American's bonuses will exclude officers; Southwest's and JetBlue's include all employees. American said it would pay bonuses ''in light of this new tax structure.'' JetBlue said that ''our Crewmembers should be the first to benefit.'' Southwest said it would put the savings from tax relief ''to work . . . to reward our hard-working Employees.''

AT&T announced $1,000 bonuses to its 200,000 employees. It also said that it will increase capital expenditures by $1 billion in 2018.

Comcast announced a $1,000 bonus for more than 100,000 employees. In addition, it plans to invest $50 billion in its infrastructure in the next five years. Comcast said the bonuses are ''[b]ased on the passage of tax reform and the FCC's action on broadband.''

Nationwide Insurance announced a $1,000 bonus for 29,000 employees and increased 401(k) matching. The company told its employees: ''The combination of the new tax legislation, including a reduced corporate tax rate, and our associates' ongoing commitment to our members, community and On Your Side promise are the reasons we're making this investment that further enhances the already robust benefits we offer to attract and retain the best talent.''

PNC Financial Services announced $1,000 bonuses for 47,500 employees as well as $1,500 to be added to existing pension accounts. The company also will raise its base pay rate to $15 per hour. PNC's CEO said: ''The tax reform law creates an opportunity to reward our employees who are working hard each day to serve our customers, build strong relationships in our communities and create long-term value for our shareholders.''

U.S. Bank announced a $1,000 bonus for nearly 60,000 employees and enhanced health care offerings in the 2019 enrollment period. It will also raise base pay rate to $15 per hour. The bank said that these decisions were ''a result of the tax reform package.''

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, 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.

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

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

DACA

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, every Member of this body is only a few generations removed from the immigrant experience. At some point in the recent past, each of our ancestors made the courageous decision to leave his home in search of a better life in America. Each of them took a risk. They didn't know what awaited them in this country, but they believed that through their own hard work and determination, they could succeed.

My mother took a huge risk when she brought my brothers and me to this country. Leaving her entire family behind, she packed our belongings into one suitcase, and we set sail for Hawaii. We grew up poor, but Mom worked so hard every day to build a life for us in this country. She worked minimum-wage jobs with no health insurance. We moved apartments and schools every few years. Eventually, we were able to bring my grandparents to Hawaii from Japan. So I understand as an immigrant how important family unification is to immigrant families.

I share my story not because I think it is particularly extraordinary but because it is a story that millions of families in our country share. The same hopes that drove my mom to risk everything to bring us to America are reflected in the stories of millions of immigrant families across the country, and they are reflected in the lives of Dreamers, whose futures are now at risk because of the President's decision to end the DACA Program.

More than 15,000 young people have already lost their protection from deportation as a result of the President's decision, and 122 more will lose DACA protection every single day. It was with this sense of urgency in mind that I joined a bipartisan group of my colleagues at the White House yesterday to find a path forward to protect the Dreamers. The President took great pains to appear reasonable and eager to make a deal, but we left yesterday's meeting without much clarity about where he stood.

Only a few days ago, the President threatened to hold Dreamers hostage until he got $18 billion to build the wall. I would call that his vanity project. In response to my question at yesterday's meeting, the President appeared to demonstrate some flexibility on this issue, but after the Freedom Caucus spent yesterday afternoon warning of a potential betrayal on so-called ''amnesty,'' the President reaffirmed in a tweet his hard-line position that funding for the wall must be part of any deal on Dreamers.

Between insisting on building an unnecessary wall, demonizing family reunification, and peddling misinformation about the diversity visa lottery, the President lost track of what is really at stake here—the inspiring young people whose lives he has left hanging in the balance.

Before the holidays, it was heartening to see so many Dreamers from all across the country taking direct action in the halls of Congress to fight for their futures. I spoke with a number of these young people, like Victor from Houston, who traveled for days to make his voice heard in Congress.

Victor's parents were seasonal farmworkers who traveled to the strawberry fields of Florida every year. They settled down in Houston and saved money for a car and an apartment. They sent for Victor and his sister when he was only 4 years old.

Victor spent most of his childhood not even knowing his immigration status. It wasn't until he came home one day with a permission slip to join his middle school class on a trip to Spain that his mom told him that he was undocumented. Learning what it meant to be undocumented—that if he traveled to Spain he couldn't come home—was really hard for Victor, but he tried to put it from his mind.

As the years passed, it got harder for Victor to grapple with his status. He loved going to school, but he knew as an undocumented immigrant that his options after he graduated from high school were limited. He developed depression, and his grades suffered. But a few months after graduation, President Obama created the DACA Program, and Victor successfully applied for it.

Victor told me that even though he had DACA, he was still too afraid to talk about his status with anyone. During the 2016 election, this changed. He confronted his friends who voted for Donald Trump and shared what losing DACA would mean for him.

On September 5, Victor knew there would be an announcement about his future. He put his phone away and started cleaning his house to distract him from what was about to happen. Eventually he ran out of distractions and sat down to watch Attorney General Jeff Sessions' DACA announcement. Victor began to cry. In the days that followed, Victor started having panic attacks—sometimes as many as five to seven per day. He was afraid to get in the car because he didn't want to hurt anyone if he got a panic attack while driving. A few weeks later, Victor showed up for his first United We Dream event in Houston. There he met fellow Dreamers and allies committed to fighting for him. He told me that it was amazing to see so many people show up in support and solidarity.

Victor made himself a promise that once the Dream Act passes, he is going to go back to school to study psychology so that he can help LGBT youth like him. Before he left, Victor said something really insightful. He said that it is really important for people to come out of the shadows to tell their stories because once you tell your story, then they can no longer demonize you.

I couldn't agree more.

Fighting to protect Dreamers is about much more than the law. It is about compassion and basic human decency. Late last night, Dreamers won a temporary reprieve when a district court judge in San Francisco issued a preliminary injunction to reinstate the DACA Program for existing enrollees. The judge said that ending DACA in the way the administration ended it was arbitrary and capricious. This was an important victory, for now. It is just a temporary injunction, a temporary reprieve. So I agree with my Democratic leader that we cannot allow this decision to make us think that we are out of the woods, not at all. It cannot dim our resolve to pass the Dream Act. The fight continues.

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. KAINE. 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. KAINE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise as many of my colleagues have this afternoon, and I have risen on the same topic often to talk about our Dreamers.

Usually, when I have risen in the past, I have told stories about Virginia Dreamers. We have about 13,000 Dreamers in Virginia. I have highlighted stories of Dreamers from Latin America, Africa, Sweden, and Asia. One of the students I talked about, Gloria Oduyoye, just graduated from William & Mary Law School within the last month and thus became the first Dreamer to be a law school graduate in Virginia and one of the few Dreamers who attained a law degree in the United States. I talked about her story.

Today I decided not to talk about stories of individuals again but to try to put it in context, with the message really being that the time is now to make a decision. We don't need more information. We just need the will to act and do what I think is the right and the fair thing to do because we have been at this discussion now—it is hard to believe we have been at this discussion for 16 years.

The American public—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—overwhelmingly support a permanent solution for Dreamers. It is not that we need to know anything more to solve this. We have been talking about it for a very long time.

I want to encourage Members of this body and in the House who are involved in the negotiation to come to an agreement and provide permanent protection for the Dreamers before next Friday so that we can protect this community, which is frightened because

they are so worried about being deported or losing their ability to work, to go to school, losing the ability to protect their families. But it is more than just protecting people because they are frightened; it is protecting them because, as I have seen in Virginia and in every State, they so enrich this country.

The first version of the DREAM Act, it is hard to believe, was introduced in 2001. The Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, who has been a champion of this and has my deepest admiration for his persistence in this endeavor, introduced the first version of the DREAM Act together with the senior Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH.

The bill has evolved since then. It wasn't exactly the same as we are contemplating now, but it was the first version of the bill. It sought to repeal a provision of the 1996 immigration reform that prohibited undocumented immigrants from eligibility for higher education. Instead, what the bill, in its original version, did 17 years ago was to grant permanent resident status to young, undocumented immigrants with a high school degree or equivalent GED who fulfilled certain residence requirements and did not have criminal records. That was the start of this discussion. We are still looking for the permanent answer.

The DREAM Act first almost passed in 2007. It attained more than a majority vote in the Senate, but it didn't get to the 60-vote threshold, so that was insufficient for passage. In 2010, the House passed the DREAM Act, but the Senate again failed to approve it with a 60-vote threshold.

In 2013, just a few months after I came to the Senate, we contemplated, debated, discussed, voted upon comprehensive immigration reform in June. I was kind of proud then. I was a young Senator, had been here a couple of months and stood in my chair and offered a speech on the floor of the Senate in Spanish to describe what was in the bill for the 45 million Americans who get their news every day in the Spanish language. After I was finished describing it, people came up to me and said: Has anybody ever done that before? And I said: Frankly, I don't know.

It turned out that it was the first time in the history of the body that a speech had been given in a language other than English. But what was important about that moment in June of 2013 was not the speech; it was the vote. The package was comprehensive. It included not just the DREAM Act but border security, assistance for employers to determine the immigration bona fides of those applying for work. These are reforms—an approval for people here on temporary protected status from El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Somalia, Sudan, and Haiti to become permanent residents and then convert that into a path to citizenship. That comprehensive immigration reform bill, in my view, represents the Senate working at its best: a bipartisan working group, coming through committee, coming to the floor with amendments. It passed this body with 68 votes in favor.

It was evidence of the naivete of a young Senator at the time that I assumed, of course, something was going to happen because it passed here with 68 votes. I knew the House wouldn't do exactly what we did, but I thought they would do something, and we would be conferencing it. But alas, I was naive; that was not to happen.

We are now in a different place, and we have the ability to act.

I supported President Obama's actions in June of 2012 to protect Dreamers—the DACA Program; and then later, the DAPA Program. I felt that those actions were completely in accord with earlier Executive actions Presidents had taken in the area of immigration.

Since June of 2012, 800,000 young people have achieved Dreamer status. Some of them aren't so young anymore. I sometimes refer to them as students and kids, but they are in the military, they are parents, they are teachers, and they are active in their communities. As I said, there are 13,000 in my State. DACA has allowed them to continue their education, to work legally, and to remain in the only country they have ever known.

I will say I was disappointed when President Trump in September announced that he would terminate the program in 6 months—in March. I felt like it was the breaking of a promise to these young people because he had said, even as a candidate and then as President, that Dreamers were good kids and that they wouldn't have anything to worry about from him.

I will say there was one aspect of what the President said—I can't just be critical without pointing out that there was one thing about what he said that I thought was right. He said: And Congress should fix it. I agreed with President Trump on that. I wish he hadn't terminated the program, but he was right that this is something for Congress to fix because anything done by Executive action, even fully within the power of a President to take it, is subject to being changed by another Executive. The lives and futures of these young people are such that we shouldn't be scaring them about whether they are protected or maybe back to being protected depending upon who was the occupant of the White House.

That Presidential announcement in March, although I was disappointed, on that core piece of it, that Congress should fix it, I think President Trump was right and I think he is right. I think this is something that Congress must fix, should fix, can fix, and we have all the information about it to fix it right now.

It has been difficult and a little bit heartbreaking to talk to these young people and their families about the fears they have. I don't live under the fear of deportation. I don't live under the fear of my job being taken away because of my status. I don't live under the fear of my kids not being able to get instate tuition and instead having to pay out-of-state or not being able to afford it at all. It is not a fear I walk around with every day. It is hard to put yourself in somebody else's shoes and experience the fear and even terror they are feeling when you yourself don't have that same exposure.

I have spent a lot of time listening to these young people and their parents in Northern Virginia and Richmond, especially, where I live, and the fear they feel is very palpable, and the panic they feel is very palpable, and I understand why. I think part of our job should not be to increase anxiety and fear; part of our job should be—when we can, when it is the right thing to do, when it is within our grasp—to take action and provide clarity and certainty so people will know what their status is. I think the time for that is now after 16 years.

Maybe the most important thing I am saying is that this is not a new issue. It is not that we need another week or another month or another year to figure out the answer. The first bill was introduced in 2001, and I think January 19, 2018, is ample time for us to now get this right and make it either part of the spending bills that we will do at year-end or part of a stand-alone bill that we could embrace as a body.

I was heartened by some of the comments by the President, as reported yesterday, during the meeting with bipartisan leadership at the White House about this. We can do it, and the time is right to do it now. So I would ask my colleagues and especially urge all those in the negotiations to make this decision and provide these wonderful young people with certainty about their future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Virginia, as well as Senator DURBIN, who has been working so hard to get this done, to stand up for the Dreamers. I give my strong support once again for taking action on the Dream Act. We need to take up this bill.

As Senator KAINE just noted, I was also heartened, after the meeting at the White House, by the fact that this President understands—he said he understands that we can't wait until March to get this done, that we need to get this done soon. For me, the easiest way to do this is by passing the Dream Act.

The Federal court decision in California yesterday will provide some temporary relief, as every single day more and more kids fall out of status. That sounds like a legal term, but for them, it changes their whole life. These are kids who literally believed our government. They were told: You register. You sign up. We are going to allow you to stay.

And then, in one little moment and with a signature, that all changed. Their lives changed. So it is now our obligation in the Senate to get this done.

We have already seen the harmful effects of the administration's decision to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, and the situation will continue to get worse until we take action. This is not just a small thing. I have met these kids. Ninety-seven percent of them either work or are in school. The average age they were when they were brought to this country is 6½ years old.

A few months back, I stood in front of a Catholic church with our archbishop of the Twin Cities, Archbishop Hebda, and a number of his parishioners and a number of the priests from that church to talk about what this meant in people's lives—kids brought over through no fault of their own.

My favorite example of a Dreamer, Senator KAINE and Mr. President, is Joseph Medina. He was brought over—and he didn't know this at the time—as a baby. His parents had died, and he was brought over to Sleepy Eye, MN, where he was raised. This was a long time ago. When he got to be the right age, he decided that he wanted to serve our country, and he signed up to serve in World War II.

Well, back then, he went to the military, to the Army, and said: I want to sign up.

They said: Well, it turns out—I don't know what term they used back then, but he was undocumented. And when I first met him at the young age of 99, as he explained to me, back then, all you did was you went to Canada for a day, with our country's OK, and slept in a hotel for a night, which is what he did, and then came back. Then he was made legal, and the Army signed him up, and he ended up going over and serving in the Pacific. He came back to this country, met his wife, got married, had a son, and that son served in the Vietnam war.

A few years ago, when he was 99, I got to bring him to Washington, and we stood in front of the World War II Memorial. There he stood. He had never seen it before, and he would never go again. He just died at the age of 103. He stood there with two Dreamers, suburban high school kids from Minnesota who wanted to join the Air Force, but they couldn't do it. They didn't have that right status. They were Dreamers too. They had been brought over as young kids.

To me, that just brought it all home. This is a war hero, someone who served our country, and this is the kind of person we are talking about when we talk about the Dreamers. His last act of patriotism in the last few years of his life was to continue to push so that other kids could serve their country just as he had and just as his son had.

While we have not reached an agreement yet on this bill, the reports on the bipartisan meeting are hopeful. But time is ticking by. Time is ticking. The American public is with us. This is not one of these issues where the public says: What are they doing? This makes no sense. No. A recent poll found that 86 percent of Americans support action to allow the Dreamers to stay here in the United States. So I am very hopeful that we can come together on a bipartisan agreement.

The Dream Act was based on one simple principle, and that is that you should have the opportunity—this set of people, 800,000 people who came over here through no fault of their own, should have that opportunity to call this country home, as they have been doing for so many years.

Passing the Dream Act isn't just the morally right thing to do, it is the economically right thing to do. One recent study estimated that ending deferred action for childhood arrivals would cost the country over $400 billion over the next 10 years. It would cost my State more than $376 million in annual revenue. We are proud to be the home of more than 6,000 Dreamers.

Since it was established in 2012, it has helped, as I have noted, nearly 800,000 young people who have lived in the United States since childhood to have better lives. Think about that—800,000 people. As I mentioned, 97 percent of them are in school or in the workforce, and 72 percent of them are currently in school pursuing a bachelor's degree or higher. More than 100 students applied to medical school last year. Nearly 100 of them are currently enrolled in medical school at a time when we need more doctors, particularly in rural areas. Those are the facts.

I note that at the meeting at the White House, the President actually said that when this got done, he wanted to pursue comprehensive immigration reform. It is something that we have done before on a bipartisan basis in the Senate, and I believe that is where we need to turn now.

We talk about the economic sense of the Dreamers. Look at our country overall. Seventy of our Fortune 500 companies are headed by immigrants. Twenty-five percent of our U.S. Nobel Laureates were born in other countries. Immigrants have been an economic engine for this country.

Everyone in this Chamber came from somewhere. Their relatives came from somewhere. My grandparents on my mom's side came from Switzerland, and on my dad's side my great-grandparents came from Slovenia. They worked in the mines. They worked so hard just to send my dad to college. They saved money in a coffee can in a basement. I am here today with great-grandparents who came straight from Slovenia, a grandfather who worked in a mine, a dad who grew up there and was the first one in the family to go to college and get a 2-year degree and then a 4-year degree, and I literally stand here on the shoulders of these immigrants.

On my mom's side, the Swiss side, my grandpa came over and ended up at Ellis Island when he was 18 years old, and they had reached the cap on Swiss immigrants. That might sound amusing, but that was the case. He then somehow got himself to Canada—I think he said he was going to live there—came back through—because he wanted to be in our country—came back through, ended up in Wisconsin, like all good Swiss, with my other relatives on my grandma's side, worked at a cheese factory, and was an alien for 20 years. He finally applied for citizenship when World War II was breaking out, and that is when they found out that, in fact, he maybe had come into the country two different ways. But back then, they listened to his story, and they gave him citizenship. Otherwise, he would have been deported—I think it was 3 weeks before the U.S. joined World War II—as a Swiss German. Instead, he married my grandma back then, they had my mom and my mom's brother, and here I am.

I am on the shoulders of those immigrants. So when I see these Dreamers, I see my own family, and I hope everyone in this Chamber sees the same thing—the American dream. That is why, Mr. President, I stand with the Senator from Virginia, Mr. KAINE, with Senator DURBIN, and so many of my colleagues who have been working on this for so long on both sides of the aisle. There has been leadership on both sides of the aisle. So let's get this done, let's pass the Dream Act, and let's never forget that we all come from somewhere.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, a number of us are here today with a very simple, straightforward demand. We must act now to pass a Dream Act. Very simply, the honor and integrity of this Chamber are at stake.

The young people who would be covered under the Dream Act are Americans in all but name. They came here as children. They grew up as Americans. They go to our schools, serve in our military, and support our economy. They work hard and they give back and they believe in the American dream. Deporting Dreamers would be cruel and irrational, inhumane, and, very simply, repugnant to basic American values.

Just think of Jonathan Gonzalez-Cruz. He is a college student at Southern Connecticut State University. I had the privilege of meeting him in December. His story has stuck with me. His story haunts me when I think of the moral imperative of this Nation to pass the Dream Act.

Jonathan was born in Mexico. He came to this country when he was just 4 years old. The United States is home for him. It is the only country he has ever known. He received a full scholarship to attend Southern Connecticut

State University, and he is set to graduate this spring with an honors degree in economics and math.

His dream is to attend law school, but due to the uncertainty surrounding DACA, he has decided to delay applying, knowing he will be unable to receive scholarships without his DACA status. He could attend, but he can't pay for it with scholarships unless he has that DACA status.

Jonathan first became compelled to speak up and tell his story after his father was deported, and they were unable to even say goodbye. Despite his own struggles, Jonathan is a passionate advocate for his community, and he actively works for Connecticut Students for a Dream. That organization, Connecticut Students for a Dream, is a group of students who help empower and advocate on behalf of other undocumented students. In fact, today, Jonathan is in DC to help ensure that the voices of students are, in fact, heard. Jonathan is a volunteer peer mentor through that organization because he is so passionate about raising graduation rates and ensuring that all students like himself have the support they need to succeed.

During his senior year, Jonathan has been interning at an immigration law firm, and he is glad to be helping others gain legal status in this country. The irony is not lost on him—and should not be lost on us—that he, himself, could face deportation this year. If Jonathan is not permitted to stay—if Congress does not act and he loses his DACA protection—Connecticut and this Nation will be the losers. Connecticut and this Nation will lose an educated and compassionate public service-minded individual who gives back to his community, to his fellow students, and to our State. He is just one example of the estimated 10,000 like him in Connecticut—and at least 700,000 around the country—who could lose their status in March if Congress fails to act now.

Very simply, we have an obligation to do our job and provide permanent status and a path to citizenship for the Dreamers. The hopeful news is, there is broad bipartisan support for affording the Dreamers protection against mass, draconian deportation. Our challenge is to make sure that what we do here reflects that broad bipartisan support in this Chamber and around the country because America knows it has made a promise. It made a promise to those Dreamers, and great countries do not break promises.

Last night, a Federal district court issued a preliminary injunction ordering DHS—the Department of Homeland Security—to resume accepting renewal applications. Once again, the courts have served as a bulwark for basic rights under rule of law, but this reprieve is no final remedy. We must redouble our determination to protect these young people from draconian, mass deportation—a continuing threat as long as President Trump refuses to reverse his cruel, unconscionable policy.

A Federal judge has struck down President Trump's order as unconstitutional, but a Dream Act is no less necessary today than it was yesterday. Congress should waste no time in swiftly passing clean legislation—a clean Dream Act to protect these young people.

When DACA was adopted in 2012, it changed the lives of young people like Jonathan. It opened new vistas. It provided Dreamers with the opportunity to get driver's licenses, to attend college, to become productive members of our economy.

Importantly, when DACA was adopted, we made that promise to these young people. We promised that if they came forward and provided the United States of America with information, some of the most personal information any of us have—information about their addresses, employment, dates of birth, their families—we would not use that information against them. They had a place here under DACA. They had rights—moral, if not legal. That promise is now about to be broken.

Great countries keep those promises. The United States is the greatest country in the history of the world. It should not be breaking promises to innocent young men and women who know only this country, who believe in the American dream, who believe in America's promises, who believed those promises when they offered that information and now are relying on the good faith of America. The rescission of DACA threatens to tear apart families, destroy lives, create disarray, and derail futures. We are a country that is better than this rescission. We are a country that keeps promises, and Congress must now act to protect these young people.

DACA protections are set to expire in 2 months. Already, tens of thousands of DACA recipients are estimated to have lost their protection from removal. The longer Congress takes to act, the longer these young people, who were promised the American dream, continue with anguish, with targets on their backs.

Continued waiting means instability to the job market because companies are forced to hire replacements for DACA recipients and train new workers in anticipation of the March deadline. It could mean a massive ejection of qualified, hard-working people vital to our economy.

This kind of massive deportation by plane, by boat, by car, by foot would be unprecedented. We have never seen anything like it before. As I have said repeatedly, this kind of mass, draconian deportation would be a humanitarian nightmare, a betrayal of America.

If Congress fails to pass the Dream Act, we will lose nearly $500 billion over the next 10 years. Let me repeat. We will lose $500 billion over the next 10 years. We will lose $25 billion in Medicare and Social Security taxes alone. In my home State of Connecticut, we stand to lose $300 million in economic benefits a year.

Now is the time to abandon the myth that the Dreamers work on the sidelines of American society. They are part of the fabric of this Nation. Their lives are woven into the great tapestry of America. They drive our economy. They give back to our communities.

The administration has thrown a ticking time bomb into their lives, but it is also a ticking time bomb in this Chamber. We have the power to defuse it. In doing so, we can give hope to hundreds of thousands of members of our society and reaffirm the greatness of our country. At stake is nothing less than the character of our country, and that is why there is such bipartisan support for the Dream Act, as evidenced yesterday in the Cabinet Room when the President met with Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle.

In the Dreamers, we see ourselves. We see relatives who came to this country years ago, many of them as teenagers. My father fled Germany at 17 years old with nothing more than the shirt on his back, speaking no English, knowing virtually no one here. Like him, they believe in America's promise, America's dream, and we should believe in the Dreamers.

Thank you, Mr. President.

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. DURBIN. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. That was an Executive order of President Obama's which provided temporary legal status to immigrant students and young people if they registered with the government, paid a fee, and passed a criminal and national security background check. It was for 2 years and renewable.

Young people who are protected by DACA are known by some as Dreamers. They came to the United States as children. They grew up singing the ''Star Spangled Banner'' and pledging allegiance to our flag. They believed that they were Americans, but legally, they are not. The average DACA recipient came to the United States at the age of 6 and has been here for approximately 20 years.

It was 7 years ago that I sent a letter to President Obama. I was joined in that letter, incidentally, by Senator Dick Lugar, a Republican from Indiana. In that letter, I asked President Obama: Can you find a way to protect these young people?

We passed the Dream Act on the floor of the House. We passed it on the floor of the Senate. We have never managed to pass it in both Chambers in the same year. And the President created the DACA Program.

The DACA Program has been a success. Approximately 800,000 Dreamers have come forward and received DACA protection. Let's allow them to be part of America as teachers, as nurses, as engineers, as first responders, and even serving in the U.S. military.

But on September 5 of this last year, 2017, Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced that the Trump administration was setting out to repeal DACA, to put an end to it. That same day, President Trump called on Congress to come up with a solution to legalize DACA. He challenged us. He said to the U.S. Senate and House: Pass a law. If this is a good idea, pass a law.

It has been more than 4 months since the President issued that challenge. The Republican leadership of Congress has not proposed any legislation to legalize DACA as the President asked.

The deportation clock is ticking for these young people who are protected. Already, 15,000 have lost their DACA status. Beginning on March 5—the deadline that initially was imposed by President Trump—every day for the next 2 years, 1,000 DACA young people will lose their ability to work legally in the United States and will be subject to being deported from this country.

Who are they? Some 20,000 of them are teachers in our schools who would lose the right to work legally and have to leave their classrooms. Nurses would leave their patients. First responders would leave their posts. And 900 soldiers would lose their ability to volunteer to risk their lives for America's future.

This isn't just a looming humanitarian crisis; it is an economic crisis. More than 91 percent of DACA Dreamers are gainfully employed and paying taxes. Many of them are students; yet they are still gainfully employed because they don't qualify for Federal assistance for higher education, so they have to work jobs, sometimes many jobs.

The nonpartisan Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy reports that DACA-eligible individuals contribute an estimated $2 billion a year in State and local taxes. The Cato Institute, a conservative operation in Washington, estimates that ending DACA and deporting DACA recipients will cost the economy $60 billion and result in a $280 billion reduction in economic growth over the next decade.

Poll after poll shows overwhelming bipartisan support for the Dreamers. FOX News found that 79 percent of Americans support a path to citizenship for Dreamers, including 63 percent of Trump voters.

The answer is clear. It was 16 years ago that I first introduced the DREAM Act—bipartisan legislation to give these young people a path to citizenship. In July of last year, I introduced the most recent version with my colleague, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina. We need to pass the Dream Act, and we need to do it now, before January 19.

Over the years, I have come to the floor to tell the story of the Dreamers. I can give a pretty nice speech here, but these stories tell the story of this issue more than anything I can add to them. These stories show what is at stake when we consider the fate of DACA and the Dream Act.

Today, I want to tell you about this young lady. Her name is Evelyn Valdez-Ward. This is the 107th Dreamer story I have told on the floor. Evelyn was 6 months old when her family brought her from Mexico to Houston, TX. She was quite a good student. She graduated 11th in her high school class of 650. She took all advanced placement classes and was a member of the National Honor Society. She was a member of the color guard in the marching band and regularly volunteered at homeless shelters and animal shelters.

It wasn't until she began to apply for college that she finally learned her immigration status. She wasn't like the other students with whom she had grown up and shared classrooms and experiences. Evelyn is undocumented, but it didn't stop her—she was going to pursue college.

One of her teachers believed in her because she was such a bright student and wrote her a letter of recommendation to go to college. She was accepted into the University of Houston. She received multiple awards while in college, including the Excellence in SI Leadership and Mentoring Award, the American Society of Plant Biology Award for Outstanding Research, and the Outstanding Biology Leadership Award.

The summer after her freshman year, she was offered a great research opportunity through the National Science Foundation. Because of DACA, she was allowed to work legally in the United States, and she was able to pursue this important research. That opportunity was in plant water transport research in California. This is where Evelyn fell in love with ecology and plants.

She graduated magna cum laude in 2016 with a bachelor of science in biology. Today, she is a second-year Ph.D. student at the University of California, Irvine, in the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. She is researching the effects of climate change on the interactions between plants and soil. Evelyn's dream is to continue her research as a scientist and to become an advocate for strategies to mitigate climate change.

In September, the American Association for the Advancement of Science wrote a letter opposing the White House decision to rescind DACA. Here is what they said:

> Many DACA students make significant contributions to the scientific and engineering enterprise in the United States . . . high-achieving young people in DACA contribute in many ways to our nation. Many are studying to become scientists, engineers, medical doctors and entrepreneurs. Given the administration's decision, we urge Congress to craft legislation that provides long-term protection for these young people who seek to continue their education and contribute to society. . . . Our nation needs an immigration policy that advances U.S. innovation and prosperity, and stays true to foundational American goals that seek contributions to society from all.

The Presiding Officer and I had a unique invitation yesterday. I would just say that as a Member of the House and of the Senate, I have never been invited to a meeting quite like the one we had yesterday with the President in the Cabinet Room of the White House. It was the President's idea. I don't know if it was a spur-of-the-moment idea, but it is one that came together very quickly in a few days.

I think there were almost 26 of us—Democrats, Republicans, House and Senate Members—who were called together by President Trump. I was kind of surprised, but there I was sitting right next to the President of the United States. It was only the third time we had ever spoken. The other two times, incidentally, were about DACA and the Dream Act, as you can probably guess. He invited me to sit next to him as we talked about this issue.

Then he did something that was really unusual. I have been to some meetings with the President in the Cabinet Room with President Obama and President George W. Bush. Usually, what happens is, the cameras come in, the President says a few words, then the staff tells them to leave, and they reluctantly pull out and leave. Yesterday was quite different. The President told the press they could stay, and they did, for almost an hour. The conversations between the President of the United States and Members of Congress were shared with the American people. I had never seen anything quite like it.

I kind of liked it, to be honest with you. I think there was a lot of candor in the room. People were expressing their points of view, and there were many different points of view, but I think I came away from that meeting with more hope than ever that we can do something about DACA and the Dream Act. The President told us he would like to see it done. He added, though, there were things he wanted to be a part of it. One of them dealt with border security, which has been a priority for all of us from the beginning.

We want to establish—both political parties want to establish that we are committed to border security, and we are. How you define it, what it costs, and how it is implemented—some of these things we can define in our agreement; others will be left to future efforts by Congress and the President.

Then he talked about the family unification, and that is an issue that is very delicate. It is one that, as my colleagues can imagine, really hits home.

It is very personal as to whether a member of a family can bring someone they love—some relative in their family—to the United States. Even if they decide to bring them—incidentally, they may be waiting 30 years, in the case of those who are seeking entry into the United States through family visas; 80 years, from China; 160 years from Mexico. Some of these things are unrealistic and will never happen, but to talk about family unification really strikes home with a lot of families.

I want to hear the President's point of view, but I want to deal with this in the most sensitive and sincere way. We don't want to flood the United States with people who are any danger to us, No. 1, or nonproductive citizens, but we certainly want to see families unified.

There is a question about diversity visas. I will not go into it because it is a long story—the creation of this program, where it is today, and where it might be in the future.

Here is what I do believe after yesterday's meeting. I believe President Donald Trump called for that meeting because he wanted to let the American people know he was serious. He wanted to show them he could be a President presiding over a table with 24, 25 Members of Congress from both political parties and tackle a sensitive, delicate, challenging issue. He wants to show the American people he can lead. I want to help him lead if the goal is to make sure DACA and the Dreamers ultimately have their chance to be part of America's future.

I am willing to work in good faith with the President to compromise, whatever it takes, to bring this forward. There are so many lives hanging in the balance, and this is one of them—this wonderful, brilliant young woman who wants to make not only the world a better place but America a better place. She simply wants the chance to be here and be part of America's future. We can give her no less.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

REMEMBERING MATT HILLYARD

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a remarkable man whose smile and beautiful soul touched the lives of everyone he met. Matthew Hillyard passed away peacefully at his family home on January 4, 2018, to the grief of not only his family and close friends but to everyone who knew him in the Utah Legislature.

Matt, the loving son of Lyle and Alice Hillyard, was born with Down syndrome. His parents were told he would not live past adolescence; yet he defied the odds and packed a lot of life into 42 years on Earth. Matt never let his disability define him; instead, he shared his special light with everyone who caught his eye.

Matt's father, Lyle, has served as a Utah lawmaker since 1981. The father-and-son duo became a fixture of the Utah Legislature. When things got tense on the senate floor, Matt's innocence stood as a light to other lawmakers, defusing tension and stress during the most heated debates. He made friends with people from all walks of life—be they legislators, security guards, or schoolchildren visiting the capitol. Matt's smile and his big hugs were legendary, and people would often line up to be the recipient of his affection.

I had the privilege of enjoying Matt's hugs and greetings on many occasions, and I never left his side without feeling I had been in the presence of a truly remarkable son of our Heavenly Father. Legislative bodies across our country would be well-served with the steady presence of someone like Matt, a kind soul who gives love and unwavering friendship to all.

I believe there is a special place in Heaven for Matt, who personified the pure love of Christ. He lived a life of sweet innocence, friendship, and love. His warm embrace and sweet smile will be greatly missed by all. It is my greatest hope that his family and all who knew him will find joy and peace in the memories we have shared with this extraordinary man.

LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, according to Landmine Monitor, which is the world's best source of data on the production, use, export, stockpiling, and clearance of landmines, cluster munitions, and other unexploded ordnance, 2016 was a terrible year for casualties caused by mines and other UXO.

In 2016, the Monitor recorded 8,605 casualties, of which at least 2,089 people were fatalities. That is the highest number since 1999, and it includes the most casualties of children ever recorded. Civilians represented 78 percent of recorded casualties in 2016. There are still 61 countries that are known to be contaminated with landmines.

On the positive side, approximately 232,000 landmines were destroyed in 2016, and 66 square miles of land were cleared of mines and other UXO. International donors and UXO affected countries increased support in 2016 for UXO clearance programs by $40 million above the previous year to $564.5 million. The United States was, like previous years, by far the largest donor.

It is also encouraging that, since March 1, 1999, when the international treaty banning antipersonnel landmines came into force, 163 countries have joined. That is an extraordinary achievement for a treaty that owes its existence to the vision and perseverance of hundreds of advocacy, human rights, arms control, humanitarian organizations, and journalists, around the world, and the leadership of former Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy; yet despite this progress and substantial declining in the past few years, the number of innocent people maimed and killed by mines has steadily increased.

There are several explanations for this. Rebel groups like ISIS routinely use landmines and other improvised explosive devices. The wars in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Yemen have been largely responsible. It may never be possible to completely eradicate the use of landmines by rebel groups, for the weapon is so cheap to manufacture while causing such harm.

But the major powers that have not joined the treaty—the United States, Russia, China, Pakistan, and India—also share the blame. Antipersonnel landmines, which are designed to be triggered indiscriminately by the victim, whether an unsuspecting farmer or an enemy or friendly combatant, have no place in the arsenals of modern militaries. It is hypocrisy to claim on the one hand, as our military does, that it uses every precaution to avoid harming civilians and prides itself on its precision weapons, and on the other hand to insist on the right to use a weapon that is the antithesis of precise and overwhelmingly harms civilians.

I have spoken more times than I can count about the scourge of antipersonnel landmines and the need for the United States to join the Mine Ban Treaty so we are no longer an excuse for other countries not to join. Our military has not used landmines for more than two decades. In fact, U.S. policy now strictly limits the use of antipersonnel mines to the Korean Peninsula, but we do not need them. What we need is the best protection for our troops to maneuver safely through minefields. We should have banned these indiscriminate weapons a long time ago, and we would have if landmines were blowing off the arms and legs of children in this Nation the way they are in others, but we have learned that the Pentagon is not in the habit of giving up weapons, even if they are weapons that deserve to be relegated to the dustbin of history. That decision will only be made by a President who is willing to do what is morally right.

Landmines have been aptly described as weapons of mass destruction in slow

motion. President Trump reacted with anger and disgust, as he should have, when Syria's President Assad used chlorine gas against his own people. He should react the same way toward antipersonnel landmines and set an example for the rest of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that a January 6, 2018, New York Times editorial on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 6, 2018]

WHY DO LAND MINES STILL KILL SO MANY?

(By the Editorial Board)

The world is rolling backward, and at a disturbingly faster pace, in the struggle to limit carnage from land mines and other booby-trap explosives. The most recent numbers, covering 2016, are appalling.

Known casualties that year came to 8,605, including 2,089 deaths, according to a new report by Landmine Monitor, a research arm of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. The toll was nearly 25 percent higher than the 6,967 maimed and dead counted a year earlier, and more than double the 3,993 in 2014. And these numbers are almost assuredly an undercount. ''In some states and areas, numerous casualties go unrecorded,'' Landmine Monitor said.

Much of the 2016 mayhem stemmed from conflicts in Afghanistan, Libya, Ukraine and Yemen, but people in 56 countries and other areas were killed or wounded by improvised explosive devices and other ordnance placed by governments or, more commonly, by insurgent groups. The sheer indecency of it is self-evident. Nearly 80 percent of the victims were civilians; children accounted for 42 percent of civilian casualties in situations where the ages were known.

One subset of the menace, cluster munitions, is singularly vicious. A single cluster bomb can contain dozens, even hundreds, of baseball-size bomblets that spray in all directions, ripping apart anything in their path. All too often, they fail to detonate right away and thus become time bombs that imperil unwary civilians who pick them up, including curious children. Cluster munitions alone caused 971 known casualties in 2016, more than twice the toll of the previous year, according to Cluster Munition Monitor. Most victims were Syrians, nearly all of them civilians, but Saudi Arabia has also used American-supplied cluster bombs in Yemen.

Perhaps the saddest part of all this is that for well over a decade the world seemed to have gotten a grip on what are referred to generically as the ''explosive remnants of war.'' Thanks to an international treaty that came into force in 1999—now signed by 163 countries and banning the production, stockpiling and transfer of land mines—casualties declined steadily worldwide. They reached a low of 3,450 in 2013, compared with 9,228 in 1999. (A companion treaty outlawing cluster munitions, joined by 119 countries, went into effect in 2010.) As the death and injury toll for 2016 shows, nearly all that hard-won progress has been erased by the brutal conflicts of recent vintage.

The picture is not irredeemably bleak. The Landmine Monitor said that 32 donors, led by the United States, contributed nearly $480 million in 2016 for mine clearance and victim aid. That was an increase of 22 percent from the year before. More than 232,000 antipersonnel mines were reportedly destroyed in 2016, and about 66 square miles—an area nearly the size of Brooklyn—were cleared of explosive hazards.

The grim reality, though, is that the land mine and cluster munitions treaties are undercut by the refusal of some of modern warfare's most powerful players to sign them. Among those countries are China, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Russia and Saudi Arabia. And the United States. The Pentagon has long insisted that eliminating cluster bombs could put soldiers at risk. As for land mines, they are deemed by Washington to be a useful tool in the demilitarized zone separating North and South Korea—a first-line defense for the South against a possible invasion. But given the North's nuclear buildup, a mined DMZ seems to be a Cold War vestige of diminished value.

Washington is not immune to international suasion. Land mines are so stigmatized that American forces have barely used them since the 1991 Persian Gulf war. The United States stockpile, estimated at three million mines, is significantly reduced from pre-treaty years; it's puny compared with the 26 million mines that Russia has on hand, according to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. Similarly, American reliance on cluster munitions, which peaked in the early stages of the 2003 Iraq war, has all but disappeared.

In 2014 the Obama administration even signaled it might be willing to join the antimine treaty. Regrettably, that step never came. It might have been a moral statement encouraging others to follow suit. Now, with President Trump openly disdainful of international agreements, the likelihood of Washington's signing the treaty would seem to be about zero. The Pentagon, under his ultimate control, recently authorized the military to restock older cluster munitions, whose immediate failure rate can be high, leaving bomblets that can explode and kill civilians even years later.

For countries like Afghanistan, Libya, Ukraine and Yemen, the risks may endure long after the guns go silent. Vietnam provides an example. Since the war there ended in 1975, at least 40,000 Vietnamese are believed to have been killed and another 60,000 wounded by American land mines, artillery shells, cluster bombs and other ordnance that failed to detonate back then. They later exploded when handled by scrap-metal scavengers and unsuspecting children.

The lesson is stark for today's war-torn countries. They could reap the same whirlwind in coming decades.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the votes on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 371 and the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 389.

On vote No. 5, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 371.

On vote No. 6, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 389.•

REMEMBERING ANNE MICHELE IRBY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today, with sadness in my heart, I wish to pay tribute to a very special person, Anne Michele Irby, a member of my staff for over 25 years and a dear friend who died on December 18, 2017.

Anne was born in Baltimore and raised in Parkville. She was the daughter of Basil T. Irby, a sales representative for the Baltimore Stationery Co., and Jean Craig, a homemaker. She attended St. Thomas More School and was a 1979 graduate of the old Seton High School in Charles Village. She received a diploma from what was then Villa Julie College and earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Baltimore. Early in her career, she worked for the Baltimore Jewish Council and then became a lobbyist for Associated Catholic Charities of Baltimore.

Anne joined my office in 1990 when I was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and remained a member of my team when I became a U.S. Senator. She was a dedicated caseworker in my Baltimore office and was an invaluable resource to my staff and the citizens of Maryland. She was an indefatigable advocate for veterans and their families and helped them navigate a complicated system to obtain disability, medical, and educational benefits. She also helped veterans obtain much-needed medical appointments and lost medals. In addition to her work with veterans, she also worked tirelessly to help Marylanders save their homes as the foreclosure crisis spread across the State during the recession.

Anne was very knowledgeable about the agencies and personnel available to serve the needs of my constituents. Agency professionals knew Anne and respected her willingness to assist those constituents in need. Anne considered her position in my office as a career, not just ''a job.'' She was a true professional who wanted to make life better for as many people as she could. That is the essence of public service.

Anne would be best described as a ''gentle soul.'' She was a devoted caregiver to her parents and close family members. She was a huge football fan. I think the only person she ever had a ''beef'' with was John Elway. The Baltimore Colts drafted him in 1983, but he refused to play for the Colts, so they had to trade him to Denver. Even though she was from Baltimore, she later cheered hard for the team from Washington after the Colts left town under the cover of darkness on March 29, 1984. She spent many Mondays talking about how her team fared on Sunday. In addition to her love of football, Anne enjoyed a good book and a hot cup of coffee. She would often visit Washington's Politics and Prose bookstore to pick up the latest bestseller or meet her favorite author. She frequented Baltimore's Woodlea Bakery and was known for bringing their donuts and cakes to the office for the rest of the staff and visitors.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said, ''To laugh often and much; To win the respect of intelligent people and the affection of children; To earn the appreciation of honest critics and endure the betrayal of false friends; To appreciate

beauty, to find the best in others; To leave the world a bit better, whether by a healthy child, a garden patch, or a redeemed social condition; To know even one life has breathed easier because you have lived. This is to have succeeded.''

Anne Irby left us much too soon, but she succeeded. She touched so many lives and helped so many people and families across the State. She will be remembered for putting the concerns of others before her own. Many people wake up every day hoping to make a difference. We can all take comfort in knowing that Anne Irby actually did make a difference. I send my deepest condolences to her sister Donna Jean Rodgers, her other family members, and her friends. We are all grieving.

I salute Anne for a job extraordinarily well done and pledge today that she will always be a member of ''Team Cardin.''

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING CLIFF EVERTS

• Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to remember and pay tribute to a pioneer of Alaska aviation, Cliff Everts, who passed away in December at the age of 95. One of the greatest compliments you can pay to a longtime Alaskan is to refer to that individual as a pioneer. Yes, Cliff was a pioneer, but that understates the reverence with which he is held in Alaska's aviation community. He is indeed an icon of Alaska aviation.

Place yourself in a remote Alaskan village in the dead of winter. The outdoor temperature is minus 25 degrees, and the village is running short of fuel. Imagine the sound of a fuel plane landing on your village's gravel runway, delivering thousands of gallons of fuel needed to sustain daily life in the bush and power remote work sites. Deliveries such as this make life in rural Alaska possible. This is the legacy of Cliff Everts.

Originally born in New York, Cliff's passion for flying began at a young age. He took his first flight at 12 years old. As a teenager, he delivered newspapers to pay for his flying lessons. Cliff trained on a Taylorcraft, a high-winged, two-seater aircraft, and was soloing within just 6 months.

Later Cliff joined the Civilian Pilot Training Program, supporting wartime efforts during World War II. It was not long thereafter that he made the decision to leave New York, to accept a position flying as a copilot for Alaska Star Airlines in Anchorage. Alaska Star Airlines was a predecessor of today's Alaska Airlines.

Having grown to love Alaska, Everts embraced the pioneer spirit and accepted another position flying for Wien Airlines in Fairbanks. He continued to fly for Wien Airlines for 35 years, logging over 30,000 hours of flight time. His flights carried mail, cargo, and passengers throughout the entire State.

While Cliff Everts was a pilot by trade, he was also a very savvy entrepreneur and was well known for his many business ventures, but he is best known for Everts Air Fuel. Cliff started this business in the 1980s flying a C–46. The C–46 is a World War II era high-altitude, multiengine aircraft. He quickly built the fleet, running his business on the philosophy that providing for the unique needs of Alaskans can be done both efficiently and affordably by Alaskans.

Cliff's son, Robert, began his own aviation business called Everts Air Cargo. Between Everts Air Cargo and Everts Air Fuel, the pair owned 21 airplanes. I understand that there are six C–46 aircraft remaining in revenue service. The Everts enterprises fly four of the six, and that is a testament to how well they treat their equipment. They are also known for treating their people exceptionally well.

Alaska was good to Cliff Everts. Cliff was great to Alaska. In recognition of his achievements, Cliff amassed numerous awards and recognitions. In 2007, Cliff received the Federal Aviation Administration's Master Pilot Award. In 2011, the general aviation side of Fairbanks International Airport, what we call ''East Ramp,'' was dedicated in Cliff's honor. In 2012, the Alaska Air Carriers Association designated Cliff as an ''Aviation Legend.'' Cliff was also inducted into the Alaska Aviation Hall of Fame. He holds the Alaska Aviation Entrepreneur Award. All appropriate recognition for a man best known for these words, ''Flying has been my life, and I can't see joy in doing anything else.''

On Saturday, January 13, Alaskans from all walks of life will come together in Fairbanks to celebrate the life of Cliff Everts. Cliff's friends and admirers will be joined by his wife Betty and their large family. On behalf of my Senate colleagues, let me take this opportunity to share our condolences with Betty and the family and to thank Cliff Everts for his outstanding life of service to aviation and Alaska.•

MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN, BICENTENNIAL

• Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 200th anniversary of Macomb County, MI. Situated along Lake Saint Clair in the southeast corner of Michigan, Macomb County is built on industry and entrepreneurship and populated with dedicated citizens and entrepreneurs.

French fur trappers were the first Europeans to arrive in the area during the 17th century, and when they recognized the possibilities presented to them within the area's marshes, they sought new opportunities for trade. Moravian missionaries later established the first organized, non-native settlement in the area in 1782 as a refuge for Native Americans who had converted to Christianity along the banks of the Clinton River. In March 1780, Christian Clemens purchased a distillery, which is considered the first building on the site of the future city of Mount Clemens. The next year, he bought 500 acres for development, and the site became known as High Banks. On January 15, 1818, Macomb County was formally organized as the third county in the Michigan territory and was named in honor of General Alexander Macomb, a highly decorated veteran of the War of 1812. High Banks was platted as the Village of Mount Clemens and named the county seat.

Starting in the early 1800s and continuing until 1840, settlers began moving into the interior of the county and carved out farms from the hardwood forests. Families began focusing on agriculture as the roots of county villages and towns began to be established by this time. Germans, Belgians, and other Europeans also began joining the original French and English settlers during this time. During the 1870s, mineral baths brought international fame to Mount Clemens as many thought the waters had healing powers, though interest in the spas eventually died out in the early 20th century.

Between 1920 and 1930, Macomb County saw its first population spike when it more than doubled from 38,000 to 77,000. This was caused by the establishment of Selfridge Field in 1917, now the Selfridge Air National Guard Base, and the beginning of the migration of automotive workers moving out of the city of Detroit. During the 1940s and 1950s, the suburbs again saw a population increase but the largest instance of growth occurred between 1950 and 1970, when more than 440,000 moved to Macomb County and helped make it one of Michigan's largest counties.

Today Macomb County encompasses 27 local municipalities that nearly 1 million Michiganders call home. Like our country, its people come from different backgrounds and ethnicities and share many different cultures. There are robust urban clusters, a prosperous manufacturing and economic industry throughout that is home to more than 18,000 businesses, and beautiful natural features and agricultural lands in the north. All of this has contributed to Macomb County having over 865,000 residents, making it the third most populated county in our great State.

Macomb County has been an integral part of Michigan and our great Nation for 200 years. As a fifth generation Michigander living in the southeast Michigan area, I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating this significant milestone for one of Michigan's most important and storied counties and all those fortunate enough to call it home. I wish Macomb County continued growth and prosperity for many years to come.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:07 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. 535. An act to encourage visits between the United States and Taiwan at all levels, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1486. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure non-profit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3202. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report on cyber vulnerability disclosures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3320. An act to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4433. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to achieve security of sensitive assets among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4555. An act to authorize the participation in overseas interagency counterterrorism task forces of personnel of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4559. An act to conduct a global aviation security review, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4561. An act to provide for third party testing of transportation security screening technology, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4564. An act to require a threat assessment on current foreign terrorist fighter activities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4569. An act to require counterterrorism information sharing coordination, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4577. An act to establish a working group to determine ways to develop a domestic canine breeding network to produce high quality explosives detection canines, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4581. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop best practices for utilizing advanced passenger information and passenger name record data for counterterrorism screening and vetting operations, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 535. An act to encourage visits between the United States and Taiwan at all levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1486. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure non-profit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3202. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report on cyber vulnerability disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3320. An act to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 4433. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to achieve security of sensitive assets among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4555. An act to authorize the participation in overseas interagency counterterrorism task forces of personnel of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4559. An act to conduct a global aviation security review, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4561. An act to provide for third party testing of transportation security screening technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4564. An act to require a threat assessment on current foreign terrorist fighter activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 4569. An act to require counterterrorism information sharing coordination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4577. An act to establish a working group to determine ways to develop a domestic canine breeding network to produce high quality explosives detection canines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4581. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop best practices for utilizing advanced passenger information and passenger name record data for counterterrorism screening and vetting operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1693. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking (Rept. No. 115–199).

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 Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 2285. A bill to require mailing addresses to correspond with the physical address at which the mail will be delivered; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. COONS):

S. 2286. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to provide greater protection and services for Peace Corps volunteers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2287. A bill to repeal the medical device excise tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 2288. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the instances in which official time may be granted for certain purposes to employees of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2289. A bill to create an Office of Cybersecurity at the Federal Trade Commission for supervision of data security at consumer reporting agencies, to require the promulgation of regulations establishing standards for effective cybersecurity at consumer reporting agencies, to impose penalties on credit reporting agencies for cybersecurity breaches that put sensitive consumer data at risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 2290. A bill to improve wildfire management operations and the safety of firefighters and communities with the best available technology; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 2291. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the individual tax rates in effect for taxable years 2018 through 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2292. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil and gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities in certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. Res. 371. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the value of the bilateral relationship between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 819

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 819, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 1006

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1006, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes.

S. 1124

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1124, a bill to grant the Director of the United States Marshals Service authority to appoint criminal investigators in the excepted service.

S. 1218

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1218, a bill to promote Federal employment for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1358

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1358, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain direct primary care service arrangements and periodic provider fees.

S. 1588

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1588, a bill to secure Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. 1650

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1650, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to support the access of marginalized youth to sexual health services, and for other purposes.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 1774

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1774, a bill to provide protections for workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization.

S. 1873

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1873, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program to establish peer specialists in patient aligned care teams at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2007

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2007, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for educational assistance programs.

S. 2186

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2186, a bill to modernize laws and policies, and eliminate discrimination, with respect to people living with HIV/AIDS, and for other purposes.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2274, a bill to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

S. RES. 363

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 363, a resolution expressing profound concern about the growing political, humanitarian, and economic crisis in Venezuela and the widespread human rights abuses perpetrated by the Government of Venezuela.

S. RES. 367

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 367, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its violence against demonstrators and calling for peaceful resolution to the concerns of the citizens of Iran.

S. RES. 368

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 368, a resolution supporting the right of all Iranian citizens to have their voices heard.

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 368, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2292. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil and gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities in certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I must say, I have seen political games being played with trying to drill off of the coast of Florida. Not only am I appalled—I have recoiled at this political game—but unfortunately I am not surprised because of what we have seen happen in the last 15 hours.

It all started late last week when the Department of the Interior released a new 5-year drilling plan. It virtually had all of the coastal waters—the Outer Continental Shelf of the entire United States—included in this plan, including that area of Florida that is off limits to drilling in law—a law that Republican Senator Mel Martinez and I passed back in 2006 that keeps drilling off of the gulf coast of Florida until the year 2022.

This new proposal would open up nearly all of the Federal waters to drilling, including all of the coastal waters of Florida, both the west coast—gulf coast—and the east coast—the Atlantic—and also the Straits of Florida, those waters that come around the Florida Keys, which is the Gulf Stream that comes right up the southeast coast of Florida. The Gulf Stream then goes out across the Atlantic, past Bermuda, and ends up in Northern Europe.

Well, our colleagues have heard this Senator many times come and talk about how keeping oil rigs away from Florida's coast is an issue that is important to our State because of our tourism economy but also because of the military missions on the west coast—the gulf—as well as the Atlantic.

As a Floridian, this Senator has been fighting this fight ever since the mid-1980s when Secretary of the Interior James Watt intended to drill off the east coast of Florida where we were launching our space shuttle, dropping the solid rocket boosters, and where we were launching our military rockets, taking our clandestine satellites into orbit and dropping the first stages. That is how I beat it back in the 1980s, but lo and behold, here we are again in the same place.

We know you can't allow drilling in the Straits of Florida right off the Florida Keys because an oilspill there would be in the Gulf Stream, and that Gulf Stream hugs the coast of southeast Florida. Can you imagine what it would do to the beaches of the Florida Keys, Miami Beach, and all up the Gold Coast of Florida, all the way to Palm Beach, all the way north to Fort Pierce, where then the Gulf Stream heads farther in a northeasterly direction out into the Atlantic?

Well, let me show you what is happening in the gulf coast. All of this in yellow is what is off limits in the Gulf of Mexico as a result of the 2006 law.

There is an obvious reason for all of this—because this line is known as the Military Mission Line. Everything east of here is the largest testing and training area in the world for the U.S. military. That is why we put this off limits to oil activity.

Oh, by the way, the testing and training mission for the entire Department of Defense is located right here at Eglin Air Force Base, which is where they brought all the pilot training for many nations for the F–35, the new super stealth jet fighter.

Guess what is going on down here in Panama City at Tyndall Air Force Base. That is where we have all the pilot training for our F–22, another one of our stealth fighters.

Down here in Key West, we have the Key West Naval Air Station. They bring in the squadrons of F–18s for the Navy at Boca Chica, which is where the airbase is, and within 2 minutes of lifting off the runway, they are over restricted airspace to do their testing and training.

By the way, what about the rest of the Navy? They bring their amphibious ships in here, going onto the beaches up there by Eglin Air Force Base. And all of the activity is not just on the surface; the testing and training mission is also subsurface because that is part of the Navy's mission as well.

There is ample opportunity to test because from here to here is 300 miles. From here to here is about 300 miles. So there is plenty of room to do this testing. This is the largest testing and training area in the world.

But painfully, over time, we have found another reason, and that was over here off of Louisiana. A little over a decade ago, there was an oilspill. It wasn't any little oilspill; it was the Deepwater Horizon, the BP well that spewed at the surface. At the bottom of the ocean, which was a mile below the surface, it spewed out 5 million barrels of oil before they got it stopped. That was a rig that did not work. There was supposed to be what is called a blowout preventer that was to go in and clamp off the well, and there was a blowout. It was defective. It didn't close off that well at the wellhead 5,000 feet below the surface of the gulf. As a result, 5 million barrels of oil spilled.

What happened to Florida's economy, not even to speak of all the fishing over in Louisiana and Alabama and Mississippi? I will tell you what happened to Florida's economy. Oil came as far east as Pensacola Beach. Photographs of oil completely covering the sugary white sands of Pensacola Beach went around the world. So what did people do? For an entire tourist season, they didn't come to any of the beaches of the gulf coast because they thought there was oil on the beach.

Painfully, that experience—not even to speak of what has been done to our environment and how much oil is still sloshing around down there on the bottom of the gulf—painfully, that experience got in the minds of the businesses all up and down the gulf coast of Florida.

By the way, over on the east coast—had that oil ever gotten into a current called the Loop Current that comes down and becomes the Gulf Stream, that oil would have ruined the tourism industry all along Florida's southeast coast, from the Keys to Miami Beach, and all the way up to Fort Pierce, FL.

Floridians feel fairly strongly about this. That is why we were fortunate, over a decade ago, in a bipartisan way, to pass a law to keep all of that area I just showed you off limits. We knew what would happen to our tourism—what people subsequently found out with the Deepwater Horizon oilspill—and we knew what would happen to threaten our national security by hampering our ability to do our training and testing.

So, voila, all of a sudden, the Trump administration announces last week that it is going to drill off all of Florida. I have sponsored legislation in the past. I have introduced bills to expand the moratorium on the gulf coast. I have sponsored other legislation to protect Florida. And today I am introducing another bill that would be a permanent ban on drilling off of Florida's coast for exactly the reasons I have just said.

Last week, when the Secretary of the Interior, Secretary Zinke, announced that they were opening up nearly all Federal waters, including all of those around Florida, we, of course, went into fighting mode again. We will fight this, and it will be defeated. It turns out that was just a political stunt because late yesterday—1 day after officially publishing the plan in the Federal Register—Secretary Zinke flew to Florida, met with the Governor of Florida for 20 minutes at the Tallahassee Airport, and suddenly announced that he had now decided to take Florida ''off the table.'' That sounds like a political stunt.

While many in Florida have seen right through this shameless political stunt, it has opened up a long list of other questions that I have now asked Secretary Zinke to answer in a letter I sent today.

What exactly does ''off the table'' mean? Is it the whole Eastern Gulf? Half of it? Is it 125 miles off the coast? Does it mean both coasts of Florida? Does it mean just one? What about the Straits of Florida, Secretary Zinke?

What about the seismic surveys? You all have said you are proceeding with that. Are those off the table too? If you are going to take Florida waters ''off the table'' in this little political stunt that was done 1 day after the Federal Register published this proposed rule, does that mean you are going to eliminate the seismic surveys? There is no reason to expose marine life and endangered species to the harmful impacts of seismic surveys if there aren't any actual plans to drill in the area. So, Mr. Secretary, are you taking those off the table?

What about your statement—it also included another caveat, Mr. Secretary. You said you were ''removing Florida from consideration for any new oil and gas platforms.'' Well, all of us know that platforms are different from wellheads. So tell me, Mr. Secretary, does that mean there will still be drilling off the coast of Florida, but the platforms themselves might be located just to the west of the Military Mission Line, and the wellhead is going to be underneath and far from that prohibited line? Mr. Secretary, does your change of heart mean that the administration now supports the bipartisan efforts of the Florida delegation to extend the moratorium on drilling in the Eastern Gulf? That is the bill that I am introducing today, and it has been introduced by Congressman Castor in the House of Representatives.

For every day that goes by without answers to these essential questions, the Secretary needs to add that much more time to the public comment period.

The Secretary's promise last night at the Tallahassee Airport, one day after publishing in the Federal Register that Florida is off limits—right now those are just empty words because the only real thing out there that exists is the law that prevents drilling off the gulf coast of Florida for the next 5 years.

The Secretary has proposed a 5-year plan to drill the rest of Florida and to start drilling in 2023 off the gulf coast of Florida.

There is also a law called the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, which spells out a very specific process for developing lease sales in Federal waters. With all of this rush, and now saying that Florida is ''off the table,'' I fear this announcement of Secretary Zinke's is going to discourage Floridians from commenting on the proposal that was published just this Monday—the one that opened up Florida's entire coastline to drilling—because Floridians have been given false assurances that they are all in the clear. That brings us back to this political stunt: Design a plan for the entire United States, publish it on Monday, and take it back on Tuesday for Florida for political reasons.

Floridians should be aware and they should make their objections known because if they don't, then the administration will try to say that they never heard objections from Floridians. It goes on and on—more political games.

Floridians aren't the only ones who need to know what this means. What about all the other States that have been affected? Did you hear that there is an uproar among the Governors of other coastal States that are in this drilling plan of the administration? They asked: Why, one day later, would you go to Florida and say ''We are eliminating it,'' but, Secretary Zinke, you didn't exempt my State—all the way from Maine in the North, all the way to Florida on the Atlantic coast,

all the other Gulf States, and then to the west coast of the United States, California all the way up to the State of Washington? It is more games.

People in Maryland, people in Massachusetts, people in the Carolinas are really upset. They ask: Why don't you eliminate the drilling that you are proposing off my State? What about out in California and Oregon and the State of Washington?

The administration and Secretary Zinke shouldn't be playing politics with an issue that is so important to all of our futures, especially so to Florida's future.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 371—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE VALUE OF THE BILATERAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

Mr. FLAKE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 371

Whereas the United States and Mexico share a nearly 2,000-mile long border that spans 4 States of the United States and 6 Mexican states;

Whereas for more than a century the United States and Mexico have maintained and fostered diplomatic ties that in 2017 allow for close cooperation and collaboration on efforts to strengthen security measures along the border, combat drug trafficking and illegal immigration, and facilitate cross-border trade;

Whereas the United States and Mexico have enjoyed economic ties for more than a century that culminated with the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994, which opened the Mexican market to the United States and Canada, creating the largest single free trade area in the world;

Whereas before the North American Free Trade Agreement was in effect, in 1993, United States trade in goods with Mexico was worth approximately $82,000,000,000, and in 2016, United States trade in goods with Mexico was worth approximately $525,000,000,000;

Whereas the United States has invested approximately $1,800,000,000 in the Mérida Initiative, which focuses on the disruption of organized criminal groups, institutionalizing the rule of law, creating a 21st-century border, and building resilient communities;

Whereas cooperation between the United States and Mexico to fight drug trafficking and organized crime has grown significantly since the implementation of the Mérida Initiative and security cooperation has intensified since 2008 as trade between the United States and Mexico has boomed;

Whereas the United States intelligence community has worked effectively with its counterparts in Mexico to assist in the arrest of top criminals and drug traffickers, notably Joaquín ''El Chapo'' Guzmán who was extradited to the United States by Mexico in 2017;

Whereas Mexico has assisted the United States in extraditing criminals and fugitives of United States law captured in Mexico and such cooperation has increased substantially, with 12 extraditions in 2000 and 79 in 2016;

Whereas Mexico has been an important partner in stanching the flow of illegal migrants from Central America bound for the United States, by deporting hundreds of thousands from Mexico before they reach the United States border;

Whereas Mexico is second to only Canada in energy trade with the United States, provides crude oil to the United States, and imports rapidly growing volumes of both petroleum products and natural gas from the United States;

Whereas recent changes to Mexico's Constitution allow for further cooperation between the United States and Mexico to develop North American energy resources to the benefit of both countries;

Whereas, in 2015, the largest share of business and tourist travelers to the United States were from Mexico;

Whereas the number of United States citizens living in Mexico has steadily increased and exceeded 1,000,000 in 2017, making United States citizens in Mexico the world's largest United States expatriate community;

Whereas Mexico is an active participant in international affairs through its membership in the United Nations and the Organization of American States, and hosted the G–20 Leaders' Summit in 2012;

Whereas the United States and Mexico maintain a robust education exchange program called the United States-Mexico Bilateral Forum on Higher Education, Innovation, and Research that strengthens student mobility between the United States and Mexico, aiming to send 100,000 Mexican students to the United States and 50,000 United States students to Mexico by 2018;

Whereas the Mexico-United States Entrepreneurship and Innovation Council is a bilateral initiative comprised of public and private sector representatives designing new initiatives alongside public policies to enhance regional competitiveness that strengthens the high-impact entrepreneurship system in North America;

Whereas the North American Free Trade Agreement was negotiated 25 years before the date of agreement to this resolution, prior to the advancement of new technologies and economies, such as the E-commerce sector, that are not addressed in the Agreement's chapters; and

Whereas approximately 80 percent of Mexico's exports go to the United States and 47 percent of Mexico's imports come from the United States, making the United States Mexico's most significant trading partner: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) values the bilateral relationship between the United States and Mexico and the many benefits derived from cooperation on security, combatting transnational crime, energy, economic engagement, and cultural engagement;

(2) recognizes that implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994, and the resulting increase in trade, has provided a platform on which cooperation with Mexico on so many levels has been possible;

(3) recognizes that Mexico is an essential partner for the United States in regional security and encourages the President to continue to strengthen ties between the United States and Mexico to help advance United States regional interests;

(4) understands that the relationship between the United States and Mexico is strengthened by interaction between people from the United States and Mexico and economic interaction;

(5) encourages United States drug enforcement agencies to continue developing strong cooperative measures with Mexico since efforts to stem the drug trade into the United States depend on Mexico's cooperation because, among other matters, more than 90 percent of heroin in the United States comes from Mexico;

(6) stresses the importance of the North American Free Trade Agreement to the United States economy and to the bilateral relationship between the United States and Mexico; and

(7) encourages the President to work toward modernization of the North American Free Trade Agreement in a way that strengthens the Agreement so that it can continue to provide benefits to the peoples of the United States and Mexico and the important bilateral relationship between the United States and Mexico.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have 2 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 ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 10, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''America's Water Infrastructure Needs and Challenges.''

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 10, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Kurt D. Engelhardt, of Louisiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, Barry W. Ashe, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Howard C. Nielson, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, and James R. Sweeney II, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Summer Lockerbie and Stephen Popick, fellows in my office, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of this session of the Congress.

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

REQUIRING THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES TO CONDUCT A STUDY AND SUBMIT A REPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 282, S. 875.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 875) to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit a report on filing requirements under the Universal Service Fund programs.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. STUDY AND REPORT ON FILING REQUIREMENTS UNDER UNIVERSAL SERVICE FUND PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Administrative Procedure Act'' means subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission;

(3) the term ''covered carrier'' means an eligible telecommunications carrier or service provider that receives universal service support under sections 214(e) and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 214(e) and 254) for the provision of service under a Universal Service Fund program; and

(4) the term ''Universal Service Fund program'' means each program of the Commission set forth under part 54 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, including—

(A) the Connect America Fund set forth under subpart D of that part;

(B) the Lifeline program set forth under subpart E of that part;

(C) the E-Rate program set forth under subpart F of that part;

(D) the Rural Health Care program set forth under subpart G of that part;

(E) the Remote Areas Fund set forth under subpart J of that part;

(F) the Connect America Fund Broadband Loop Support program set forth under subpart K of that part;

(G) the Mobility Fund set forth under subpart L of that part; and

(H) the High Cost Loop Support for Rate-of-Return Carriers program set forth under subpart M of that part.

(b) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit to the Commission, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report, which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the filing requirements for covered carriers participating in a Universal Service Fund program, including any filings required by the Universal Service Administrative Company;

(2) an analysis of the financial impact of those filing requirements on covered carriers participating in a Universal Service Fund program; and

(3) recommendations, if any, on how to consolidate redundant filing requirements for covered carriers participating in a Universal Service Fund program.

(c) RULEMAKING.—

(1) NEW OR ONGOING RULEMAKING.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), not later than 60 days after the date on which the report is submitted under subsection (b), the Commission shall—

(A)(i) initiate a rulemaking to consolidate redundant filing requirements for covered carriers participating in a Universal Service Fund program; and

(ii) incorporate into the rulemaking under clause (i), and as part of that rulemaking seek comment on, the recommendations described in subsection (b)(3), if any, except to the extent that doing so would violate the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act; or

(B) incorporate into an ongoing rulemaking relating to consolidating redundant filing requirements of the Commission, and as part of that rulemaking seek comment on, the recommendations described in subsection (b)(3), if any, except to the extent that doing so would violate the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(2) WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.—In a rulemaking in which the Commission is required under paragraph (1) to seek comment on the recommendations described in subsection (b)(3), if any, the Commission shall also seek comment on and consider whether the benefit of each recommendation is outweighed by any potential increased risk of waste, fraud, and abuse in the Universal Service Fund program affected by the recommendation.

(3) PREVIOUS RULEMAKING.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if, on or before the date on which the report is submitted under subsection (b), the Commission completes a rulemaking to consolidate redundant filing requirements for covered carriers participating in a Universal Service Fund program.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 875), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 11; 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; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Brown nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:42 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 11, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

PAUL C. NEY, JR., OF TENNESSEE, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE JENNIFER M. O'CONNOR.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

HOLLY W. GREAVES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE BARBARA J. BENNETT, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 10, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

THOMAS LEE ROBINSON PARKER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CAREER OF SPECIAL AGENT-IN-CHARGE CJ HYMAN

HON. TREY GOWDY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following Proclamation in honor of a friend and an exceptional Special Agent-in-Charge at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. I want to recognize the career of Special Agent-in-Charge CJ Hyman, who retired in December after more than 30 years of distinguished service at the ATF.

Whereas, Special Agent-in-Charge Hyman began his career with the ATF in 1987, as a Special Agent in Charlotte, North Carolina. There Special Agent Hyman played an integral role in the forming of the Charlotte Violent Crime Task Force, in which he investigated and prosecuted narcotics and firearms trafficking as well as robberies, kidnappings, and homicides. Special Agent Hyman would be selected to lead the task force for five years, during which time he supervised and led the investigation of Eric Rudolph after he bombed an abortion clinic in Birmingham, Alabama, in 1998.

Whereas, over the course of 30 plus years, Special Agent-in-Charge Hyman served in numerous other leadership positions including as the Resident Agent-in-Charge in the Greenville, South Carolina Field Office for ten years and as the Special Agent-in-Charge of the Charlotte Field Division, encompassing both North and South Carolina. In each position that Special Agent-in-Charge Hyman has held throughout his career, he has provided outstanding leadership and integrity in his service to the Carolinas.

Whereas, 31 December 2017, Special Agent-in-Charge Hyman officially retired from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, having faithfully served this great nation for more than 30 years. Be it

Resolved, That I, Trey Gowdy, do congratulate Special Agent-in-Charge CJ Hyman, his wife Leslie, their two children, Josh and Casey for their unwavering commitment and devotion to service of our great nation and thank them for their unwavering loyalty, dedication and contributions to the Carolinas and the Fourth Congressional District of South Carolina.

HONORING JUDGE CHUNG PAK

HON. JAMIE RASKIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my constituent and friend, Judge Chung Pak, for his extraordinary career in public service and his exemplary commitment to serving his community and the great State of Maryland.

Judge Pak is retiring after 31 years of splendid government service. For more than 23 years, Judge Pak served as an Administrative Patent Judge with the U.S. Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB), where he adjudicated more than 6,000 patent cases and personally issued over 2,000 opinions. Judge Pak has also served on the PTAB New Judge Training Committee, the PTAB Publication Committee, the Board of Patent Appeals, the Patent Academy Course Review Committee, and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Diversity Council.

Judge Pak embodies the spirit of the American Dream and the immigrant success story. In 1971, he immigrated with his family from South Korea to Alabama, where he worked at the local Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurant. In high school, he played nose guard on the football team, but it was his extraordinary skill on the tennis court that ultimately earned him a scholarship to Auburn University. After earning a degree in chemical engineering, Chung attended the Columbus School of Law at the Catholic University of America, where he became a moot court champion.

Prior to his appointment to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, Pak was an intellectual property counsel at Praxair, Inc. and Union Carbide Corporation, where he worked on a wide range of issues including domestic and foreign patent procurement, litigation, trade secrets, antitrust, and licensing. He also served as a Primary Patent Examiner and an Assistant Patent Examiner at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office for more than eight years.

Judge Pak is a widely-respected community leader who has volunteered his time and invested his energy in a number of state and local causes. He has served as Co-Chair of the NAACP Montgomery County's Multicultural Partnership Committee, Board Member of the Senior Executive Association, member of Germantown Police Advisory Committee, member of the Maryland Attorney General's Advisory Council, and as a Maryland Higher Education Commissioner.

In recognition of his passionate commitment to public service, Judge Pak has received the President's Volunteer Service Award, the Maryland Governor's Volunteer Service Award, Progressive Maryland's Progressive Leader Award, and the Montgomery County Police Department's Award of Appreciation. He was also inducted into the Montgomery County Human Rights Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Judge Chung Pak for a long and distinguished career in public service and in celebrating his dedication to his community and our country.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DR. EUGENE G. ARTHURS

HON. SUZAN K. DelBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Eugene G. Arthurs, a visionary leader, dedicated scholar, and passionate advocate for science and technology, on the occasion of his retirement from SPIE, the international society for optics and photonics. Dr. Arthurs led SPIE from its headquarters in Bellingham, WA. During his tenure, SPIE grew to 19,000 members and 264,000 constituents representing optics and photonics experts and industry leaders in 166 countries, making Bellingham the home to a top international scientific society.

Dr. Arthurs' distinguished career as a physicist, educator, CEO, and global photonics community leader provided him with the opportunity to share his passion for the science and beauty of light with students, researchers, and politicians across the globe. He was one of the driving forces behind the launch of the National Photonics Initiative (NPI), an alliance of top scientific societies uniting industry and academia to raise awareness of photonics. He has been a tireless spokesperson for the need of the science and technology community to engage with policymakers.

Before he joined SPIE in 1999, he spent 25 years working in photonics in the United Kingdom and the United States. He was the first member of his family to get a science degree, receiving his Bachelor of Science with honors in physics and his doctorate in applied physics from Queens University Belfast. He taught optoelectronics at Queens and conducted research at the Imperial College of London before immigrating to the United States in 1980.

I would like to thank Dr. Arthurs for his commitment and dedication to the field. He has been an asset to the science policy community, and his guidance in the creation of the NPI provided a solid foundation in photonics advocacy work. I wish him the best and hope he continues to find inspiration in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. GREGORY O. DIAS, JR.

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleague, Representative DEVIN NUNES, rise today to honor the life of Mr. Gregory O. Dias, Jr., affectionately known as "Butch," who unexpectedly passed away on December 16, 2017.

Mr. Gregory O. Dias, Jr. was born in Hanford, California on December 31, 1948. His

maternal grandfather bestowed the nickname "Butch" upon him at a young age and it stuck with him his entire life. Butch was the first born son of Gregory O. and Vivian M. Dias. He attended Kit Carson Elementary School and Hanford Union High School before attending California State University, Fresno. He was involved with his family's farm operation most of his life, eventually helping his parents form their family business, Gregory O. Dias and Sons Dairy and Farming Incorporated. Butch helped his parents grow the business into many dairies and farms throughout Kings and Tulare Counties.

In 1974, Butch married Alice Vander Tuig in Hanford, California. While growing their business, the couple had three children, Rachelle, Darren, and Gregory. Eventually, Butch and his wife acquired Delta View Dairy Farming, which they renamed Rachelle's Jerseys in honor of their daughter, Rachelle, who lost her life in a tragic car accident.

A third-generation dairy farmer, Mr. Dias was a great farmer and a true leader within the industry. He was passionate about farming, the land, and the animal and enjoyed working with his two sons Greg and Darren every day. In addition to agriculture, Butch enjoyed traveling the world.

He traveled the world learning about other cultures and making friends, all while promoting California agriculture abroad. Butch enjoyed talking, visiting, entertaining, and cooking. He was a "barbecue specialist" who often volunteered to cook for family events and community activities. His barbecue was renown throughout the Central Valley. He believed one should give back to his community, and led by example, contributing extensively to the surrounding community.

Mr. Dias was involved in numerous organizations throughout his life: 4–H Mid Valley Chapter, Hanford FFA, State Champion Milk Judging Team, Kings County Herd Improvement Association, California Milk Advisory Board, Dairyman's Cooperative Creamery association, California Dairy Research Council, U.S. Jersey Association, Luso-American, Delta View School District, Widgeon Land and Cattle, Exeter Duck Club and Farm Credit West. Butch also bravely served his country in the Vietnam War as a member of the United States Navy.

Butch is survived by his wife Alice, their sons; Darren and his wife Tabitha, and Gregory and his wife Melanie. Butch loved his children and was blessed to become a grandfather to their children, Nixon, Wren, Hudson, Bristol, and Reed.

Mr. Speaker, today we ask our colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join us in honoring the life of Mr. Gregory O. "Butch" Dias, Jr. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends during this difficult time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes Tuesday, January 9, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted: Roll Call No. 2, Aye; Roll Call No. 3, Aye; and Roll Call No. 4, Aye.

THERE IS LIGHT

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a great American Hero, The Eagle of The Senate and his coming battle. Our hopes and prayers are with JOHN MCCAIN. I ask that this poem penned in his honor by Albert Carey Caswell be included in the RECORD.

There is darkness
And there is light
Coming out of the darkness burning ever so bright
With the kind of faith of our Fathers, which built this Nation ignites
Of hope, faith, honor, service, and courage ever so bright
Now, there is a battle,
And there is a fight
Looming out in the darkness on the floor of the Senate on this very night
With all of our Nation's prayers in sight
As once again,
America's Son, her Hero, her friend,
John McCain is in the battle for his life.
As this great leader's heart once again must somehow ignite
But, where there is darkness,
there is the light.
And you'll find men like John McCain,
this Top Gun whose soul burns ever so very bright
Coming out of the darkness burning so bright
Who out of this darkness will bring his light,
The kind which built this great Nation to its very height
As has John been armed with throughout the generations,
with "The Faith of His Fathers" so all in plain sight
Who have fought and served this Nation with all of their might
Like Father Like Son, as has John always this one
Courageously served this Nation,
starting with his ancestor serving under George Washington
As his Grandfather and Father,
the first Admiral team serving this Nation as one
All too has John all in his life's work in what he has done
Showing us all,
the definition of courage as one of America's Greatest of Sons
Not as The Lion of The Senate but as an Eagle this one
Who throughout the years has soared on the floor of the Senate,
battling for each and every one
Crossing the aisle,
this man of such style when it had to be done
Leading everyone
Now there's a battle
And there's a fight
Upon, the Senate floor on this very night
With America's Hero heart burning bright
Coming out of this darkness shining his light
To teach us all what is magnificent and what is right
Now, it's fourth and long
As America's Son's heart beats strong.
My money is on John,
Whose life sings like a song,
Who has always come out of the darkness,
With the heart of a champion and an eagle to which it belongs.
No matter the battle,
No matter the fight,
Even as a POW, this Hero came out of that darkness shining bright.
John, your roommate in the Hanoi Hilton Bud Day,
up in Heaven,
is watching over you on this very night.
Because, John has always come armed with his light.
No matter the battle,
No matter the fight,
Either way John, the world still wins.
Continuing as the leader of the Senate, as America's friend
Or as an Angel in The Army of our Lord whose time so begins
To watch over us again and again
To fight that battle against the darkness which we must win
John, win that war.
Win that fight!
For you have blessed this great Nation with all of your light
But, my money's on you John,
because in the end the darkness does not match the light,
The kind brilliance which emanates from your great soul on this very night.
God bless you our Son in your upcoming fight
As you bless our hearts once again,
we look upon your light.
There is light.
Amen.

COMPACT IMPACT RELIEF ACT

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduce the Compact Impact Relief Act to address the costs of providing local public services to migrants under the Compacts of Free Association.

I am very pleased to have the support of our colleagues from Hawai'i and the Northern Mariana Islands, as original cosponsors.

Under the Compacts, an unlimited number of citizens from three Freely Associated States (FAS)—the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and Palau—may live and work in the United States.

Compact migrants effectively enjoy the same freedoms of movement and to work as lawful permanent residents, like green card holders, in our country do.

As such, our bill seeks to allow Compact migrants to participate in select federal programs, if they meet the program criteria, the same way that green card holders can under current law.

Importantly, our bill ensures that federal resources are not diverted from U.S. citizens and nationals in order to accommodate Compact migrants.

Economic conditions and the reality of climate change for Pacific island nations have driven more and more Compact migrants to the United States.

Guam remains the primary destination for Compact migrants, followed closely by Hawai'i.

According to the most recent Census Bureau figures, more than 76,000 FAS citizens reside in the United States, including nearly 18,000 on Guam.

I appreciate that the Compacts remain important to American strategic interests in the Asia-Pacific region, including Guam's security.

I also know—firsthand—the significant contributions that Compact migrants make to

Guam and other communities as far away as Springdale, Arkansas.

Many citizens of the Freely Associated States serve proudly in the United States military.

However, insufficient support from the federal government causes serious strain on local jurisdictions with significant Compact migrant communities.

The costs borne by GovGuam and other local governments are simply unsustainable.

Congress must act to provide federal relief to Guam and other jurisdictions required to serve these underprivileged Compact migrant communities.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the Compact Impact Relief Act would do.

Our bill includes novel policy changes that would provide additional federal resources for Guam, Hawai'i, and other states and territories.

In particular, the Compact Impact Relief Act ensures that Guam—and other territories—can utilize fully important federal programs including: Job Corps centers funded by the U.S. Department of Labor; national and community service programs like AmeriCorps and the Youth Conservation Corps; and an accurate 10-year census that counts Compact migrant residents.

Our bill would permit Guam and other affected jurisdictions to apply costs spent providing public services to Compact migrants toward the non-federal portion required to provide Medicaid to Americans.

The bill also classifies Compact migrant schoolchildren as ''federally connected students'' to make local schools serving them eligible for impact aid funding from the U.S. Department of Education.

Importantly, our bill authorizes additional funding so that Compact migrant students do not take resources away from school districts receiving federal impact aid currently.

Next, our bill requires comprehensive assessments of: the Compacts and their implementation; the economies of jurisdiction affected by the Compacts and the three Freely Associated States; and the unique health needs of Pacific Islanders.

As the United States looks to renew the Compacts ahead of their expiration in fiscal year 2023, the federal government cannot continue to force local jurisdictions to shoulder the substantial costs of accommodating Compact migrants.

Guam and other states and territories affected by Compact migrants need to be reimbursed fairly for the costs of serving these underprivileged communities.

Congress must increase mandatory funding for Compact impact to the level recommended by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), as I have called for consistently.

In the meantime, I urge this House to pass the practical policy changes included in my Compact Impact Relief Act into law.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on Monday, January 8, and Tuesday, January 9, 2018, due to a family emergency.

If I had been able to vote, I would have voted as follows:

On the Quorum Call for establishing a quorum in the House of Representatives for the Second Session of the 115th Congress, I would have answered ''present.''

On H. Res. 676, supporting the rights of the people of Iran to free expression, condemning the Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests, and for other purposes, I would have voted ''yea.''

On H.R. 4564, the Post-Caliphate Threat Assessment Act of 2017, I would have voted ''yea.''

On H.R. 4581, the Screening and Vetting Passenger Exchange Act of 2017, I would have voted ''yea.''

IN HONOR OF PHYLLIS HAHN'S RECOGNITION FOR HER OUTSTANDING WORK SUPPORTING OUR VETERANS

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Phyllis Hahn on being recognized with twin Certificates of Commendation for her outstanding cooperation and participation in serving our veterans.

Inspired by her family's long tradition of military service and the deep national patriotism and commitment to supporting our armed forces she grew up with during World War II, Phyllis has been dedicated to assisting and honoring our veterans for almost 70 years. Phyllis joined the American Legion Auxiliary Unit No. 1 at 15 and the Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary No. 3511 one year later because she was too young to serve in the military herself. Since then, she has been an active and faithful member of both organizations, currently serving as the president of the American Legion Auxiliary and treasurer of the VFW Auxiliary.

Phyllis' patriotism and dedication to supporting our veterans is exceptional. She understands the needs of our former servicemen and is committed to giving them the assistance they need and deserve. Phyllis has made an excellent example to her friends, her family, and people across our state.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Phyllis Hahn for her recognition, and thank her for her commitment and many contributions to our veterans and to our great state.

RECOGNIZING GREG KOSTKA IN HONOR OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE HOUSE OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, each year for the past 57 years the Congress has passed annual legislation to authorize the policies, programs, and activities of the Department of Defense. Today, we refer to this important legislation as the National Defense Authorization Act. Crafting this bill is no easy task, and it couldn't be done without the countless hours of work put in by the House Armed Services Committee staff and the attorneys at the House Office of Legislative Counsel. Today, I rise to honor a member of the legislative counsel team to thank him for his 31 years of service to the House of Representatives, and especially to the House Armed Services Committee.

A graduate of the University of Wisconsin Law School, Greg Kostka joined the House Office of Legislative Counsel in 1986 and has had a hand in the drafting of each National Defense Authorization Act since the Fiscal Year 1989 bill. While Greg's focus areas have been in military personnel, military justice, military construction, and readiness, he is known by his colleagues as someone capable of drafting in virtually any area of defense law if called upon. And from 2016 to 2017, Greg served as the defense team lead in the Office of Legislative Counsel.

Greg's expertise and interest in the military extended beyond his time drafting legislation in his office. As an amateur historian of the Civil War, Greg wrote an unofficial history of the role of the Third U.S. Regular Infantry during the American Civil War. I understand that he also participated in Civil War reenactments.

Greg was a regular participant in annual legislative update programs for the military's Judge Advocate Generals and accompanied committee staff on visits to several military installations. Greg brought his expertise and interest with him every day, and his work showed that he cared deeply about the men and women who serve in uniform.

Greg's professionalism and institutional knowledge have been greatly appreciated by his colleagues in the Office of Legislative Counsel as well as by Members and staff who have had the pleasure of working with him over the years. After 31 years of dedicated service to the House of Representatives, Greg announced his retirement from the Office of Legislative Counsel on December 31, 2017.

On behalf of all the Members and staff of the House Armed Services Committee, I offer my sincere gratitude to Greg for his expertise and wise counsel over the years and wish him, and his wife Jeanine, all the best in his retirement.

HONORING GUS FRANK, CHAIRMAN OF THE FOREST COUNTY POTAWATOMI EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gus Frank, Chairman of the Forest County Potawatomi Executive Council, who recently announced that he is retiring after 20 years of dedicated service to his tribe. Gus has worked tirelessly for the benefit of his people—and he's always done it with a smile on his face. I'm proud to have worked with Gus for several years on many issues affecting our communities and I'm proud to call him a friend. I congratulate him on his retirement. Gus has truly earned it.

HONORING CARRIE STUART OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR MORE THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE TO HER COMMUNITY

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I extend my sincere congratulations to my constituent, Carrie Stuart, on more than 20 years of service with the Gettysburg Adams Chamber of Commerce.

Carrie began her tenure at the Gettysburg Adams Chamber of Commerce as a temporary employee, but later became the full-time Office Manager. In 2008, she was named the organization's president.

During her tenure, the Chamber created a dialogue with other economic organizations in Adams County to attract new businesses and grow the local economy, instituted new programs to benefit Chamber members, invested thousands of dollars back into the local community, and worked with the business and education community to identify critical workforce development needs.

Carrie also has been an active member of many community service organizations, including the United Way of Adams County, Main Street Gettysburg, the Adams Economic Alliance, and many others.

Carrie Stuart's tireless dedication and professionalism has touched the lives of countless people and challenges all with whom she serves to be the best. She continues to build an impressive legacy of service to our community.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I thank and congratulate Carrie Stuart on her 20 years of service and look forward to working with her in the years ahead.

IN HONOR OF ANN ELIZABETH LEE

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of Ann Elizabeth Lee, a longtime resident of Conroe, TX, and a devoted educator, community leader, and friend.

Born in Austin, TX, Ann Lee discovered her natural talent and love for music at an early age. After relocating with her family to Taylor, TX, Ann worked to improve her musical abilities and became heavily involved in music programs, such as the Honors Band, Stage Band, and the choir at Taylor High School.

Upon her graduation, Ann attended Sam Houston State University, where she majored in Music Education and continued to refine her talent. Ultimately, Ann graduated magna cum laude, ranking in the top ten percent of her class.

In 1977, Ann moved to Conroe, TX, where she began a new chapter of her life as the choral director for Conroe High School—a position she held for eight years. Throughout her time in Conroe, Ann worked with countless young men and women, instilling in them a love for music and a discipline that would guide them throughout the remainder of their lives.

In addition to her position at the high school, Ann took on the role of Director of Music at the First United Methodist Church in Conroe. There, Ann uncovered her passion for music ministry, began performing for her church's congregation, and worked tirelessly to serve her community. Her love for the people of Conroe led her to join the Conroe Lions Club, where she worked in her community for over thirty years.

In 1984, Ann became the director of the Conroe Chorale. Ann took the Chorale, now known as the Montgomery County Choral Society, to new heights. She organized community concerts and traveled with the group on multiple international trips, taking their performances and concerts across Europe.

Ann's passion for her students, her church, her community, and her music led her to positively influence the lives of everyone who crossed her path. She made a lasting impact on the people of Conroe, and I was honored to call her my friend.

I join Ann's family, friends, and the thousands of people she impacted over her lifetime in recognizing and honoring her many years of service to the Conroe Community. Ann passed away on November 13, 2017, and she will be sorely missed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PHILIP MARKOWICZ

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary life of Philip Markowicz, who was a resident of Sylvania, Ohio and Aventura, Florida. Phil was also a renowned author and lecturer on the Holocaust and Judaism as a survivor of the Holocaust. As a business leader, he founded Phil's TV and Appliance in Toledo, Ohio.

Phil was born in 1924 in Przerab, Poland where he attended the Przedborz Yeshiva and was known as a Bible and Talmud prodigy, and had the intention of becoming ordained as a rabbi.

Unfortunately, the 1939 Nazi Invasion of Poland shutdown the Przedborz Yeshiva and as a teenager through the first years of World War II Phil was confined in the Lodz Ghetto working as a slave laborer under Nazi rule. He spent all of his nonworking time in intensive study of many of the classic works of history, philosophy and political thought, supplementing his orthodox religious studies.

When the Lodz Ghetto was dismantled, Phil was deported by the Nazis to the Auschwitz-Birkenau death camp. He realized that staying there meant certain death and he sneaked into an outside work detail, avoiding the gas chambers and crematoria. Along with his brother, Henry, he survived slave labor concentration camps, disease, beatings and starvation, culminating in a death march, until he was liberated by the American forces in the spring of 1945. His body was wracked with typhus and tuberculosis and he weighed only 87 pounds. He and his brother were the only survivors of the Holocaust—their entire family had perished.

After a few months of recovery in a hospital, Phil was sent to a Displaced Persons camp in Germany where he was elected to the governing council. It was there that he met and married his wife, Ruth Fajerman Markowicz, who was also a Holocaust survivor, and they had a son, Allen Markowicz. The Markowicz marriage and the birth of their son were the first of each in the camp.

After waiting for five years, the family was permitted to immigrate to the United States in 1950, and upon arriving in Toledo, Ohio, Phil found employment, sometimes working two or three jobs at a time while studying the newly growing field of television and electronics. In less than 10 years Phil and his wife Ruth established a successful business, Phil's TV and Appliance, and added two daughters to their family, Sylvia and Diane.

Phil eventually resumed his study of Torah. He wrote a well-received memoir, My Three Lives. A musical oratorio which was inspired by Mr. Markowicz's life and philosophical writings, Tikvah (Hope), has been performed at the Toledo Museum of Art; in Champaign-Urbana, Illinois; at Bowling Green State University; at the Detroit Holocaust Memorial Museum; in North Carolina; at the Jewish Theater of the South in Atlanta; and was part of the Martin Luther King Memorial Week ceremonies in Atlanta in 2006. Phil was a featured interviewee on the award-winning documentary Bearing Witness: The Voices of Our Survivors.

Phil spoke on the Holocaust and on Torah at various venues, including Universities, secondary schools, religious institutions, seminars and Public Television. He was invited to lead religious services, read from the Torah and its accompanying Haftorah, and present sermons. Phil served as a president of the Tarbuth Society, one of the Torah study groups in which he participated, and was a member of Congregation B'nai Israel in Sylvania, Ohio and the Aventura Turnberry Jewish Center Synagogue in Aventura, Florida.

In addition to his wife, Ruth, he was preceded in death by his daughter, Diane Markowicz; his brother, Henry Markowicz; and the rest of his family in the Holocaust.

Phil will ultimately be remembered for his dedication to his family, and we offer his children, Dr. Allen and Sylvia, his nine grandchildren and nine great-grandchildren, and his friends our prayers. May they find comfort in the poignant and profound memories of what Phil endured and survived, and what his life has embodied for generations to come.

SUPPORTING H.R. 535 AND H.R. 3320

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of two measures, H.R. 535 and H.R. 3320.

Both of these measures are aimed at strengthening our bonds with Taiwan, a partner in every sense of the word—in trade, in technology, and in culture. Over the last decade, Taiwan has emerged as a vibrant and liberal democracy of more than 23 million people, and remains a key ally in the Asia Pacific region. I support H.R. 535, which would

strengthen U.S.—Taiwan relations by encouraging travel between the two nations by high-level officials, and H.R. 3320, which directs the Secretary of State to develop a plan to regain Taiwan's observer status in the World Health Organization.

Adoption of these bills would underscore the United States' commitment to our relationship with Taiwan, and I encourage my colleagues to support them as well.

IN HONOR OF EUGENE AND RUTH ANN YINGER'S 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Eugene and Ruth Ann Yinger on their 50th Wedding Anniversary.

This significant benchmark is a symbol of their commitment to each other and to their family. I am happy to join their friends and family in extending my best to them on this special occasion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Eugene and Ruth Ann on the celebration of their 50th Wedding Anniversary. I wish them the best today and for many more blessed years to come.

RECOGNIZING MS. MARIE COLEMAN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE U.S. RAIL INDUSTRY

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to recognize Ms. Marie Coleman for her many years of service to the U.S. Rail Industry. On January 10, 2018, Marie will have dedicated 50 years of service to several prominent American railroads. With decades of success serving the people of Pennsylvania and Americans across the country, I know I will neither be the first, nor the last, to applaud her distinguished professional accomplishments.

Ms. Coleman began her career in 1968 with the Pennsylvania Railroad. Shortly thereafter, she moved to work for Penn Central, where she remained from the time of its founding until April 1976, when, through an Act of Congress, it was included in a merger to form the Consolidated Rail Corporation. There, she served in numerous roles for more than a decade from 1976 to 1998. In the 20 years since, she has served the Norfolk Southern railroad system.

A lifelong Pennsylvanian, Ms. Coleman is a proud railroader who has served under 11 different CEOs. Her unwavering dedication throughout her career helped bring an industry back from the brink of extinction to become a powerful catalyst for American economic growth. There is no doubt that Ms. Coleman's service to the U.S. Rail Industry contributed to its success.

We can all look to Ms. Marie Coleman as an example of how one person's professional hard work and dedication can not only be a rewarding journey, but also help shape the future of one of America's most important industries.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Ms. Coleman on reaching this incredible milestone in her career and wishing her luck in her continued role at Norfolk Southern.

HONORING PATRICK McMULLEN

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank Patrick McMullen for his service to the Committee on Ethics. Since 2011, Patrick's skill as a lawyer and manager has been integral to the Committee's important work enforcing the House ethics rules.

Patrick served as an Investigative Counsel for the Committee during the 112th and 113th Congresses. In that role he worked tirelessly to provide the Committee Members with fair and creative advice on difficult issues.

In the 114th Congress Patrick rose to become the Committee's Director of Investigations. In this role, he has managed a team of nonpartisan attorneys and investigators that successfully handled a busy docket of investigations. Throughout that time, he instilled in his team a dedication to uncovering the truth with care and impartiality.

At the House Ethics Committee, we are responsible for protecting the integrity of the House of Representatives. The staff works every day to increase the American people's confidence in Congress. The work of the Ethics Committee is done confidentially so people do not often know everything happening behind the scenes by our incredible, non-partisan staff. As Patrick prepares to leave the Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to recognize the great work he and his team have done. He truly has been a leader in our office and in increasing confidence in Congress.

While I am saddened by his departure from the Committee, I wish him well in his future endeavors.

HONORING PATRICK McMULLEN

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank Patrick McMullen for his service to the Committee on Ethics. Patrick has been a dedicated public servant, and has worked hard to ensure that all House Members, officers, and staff meet the highest ethical standards.

During his tenure with the Committee's investigations team, the Committee has conducted more than 225 investigations. As Director of Investigations, he has helped the Committee assemble and has overseen a terrific team of nonpartisan attorneys and professional staff who make this possible.

Patrick's commitment to conducting fair, thorough, and nonpartisan investigations and leading the investigations team with these principles has been an asset to the Committee and its Members as they carry out the Committee's important service to the House and the public.

On behalf of a grateful Committee, we thank him for his service and wish him all the best in his transition to the next phase of his career.

REPORT TO CONGRESS REGARDING THE ARIZONA BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT PLANNING CONVENTION

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great satisfaction and pride that I report the outcome of the first formally authorized national Convention of State Legislatures to convene in 156 years. The ''Arizona Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA) Planning Convention'' was held September 12–15, 2017 in the chamber of the Arizona House of Representatives. The purpose of the convention was to discuss and plan for an eventual Article V—convention of states to propose a federal balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

The convention was formally called by the Arizona legislature's passage of HCR2022 sponsored by the Arizona Speaker of the House, J.D. Mesnard, on March 16, 2017. Pursuant to that resolution, the purpose of the convention was to create a proposed set of rules for adoption by and to govern a future single subject Article V convention to propose a BBA. Additionally, delegates were instructed to address the logistics involved in preparing for and participating in an upcoming Article V BBA convention. This report is intended to inform the work of the Arizona BBA Planning Convention and highlight areas of importance.

The Arizona BBA Planning Convention has created a roadmap for future conventions to draw upon when they convene, and has provided a sense of security to those who questioned the ability of State delegates to hold a convention that would address solely its single purpose and nothing more. It was an important endeavor that deserves proper cataloguing in the appropriate annals to include the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Library of Congress, the National Archives, State Libraries, and the participating State Legislatures' records. I submit this congressional report and ask that you consider the work of the delegates as legitimate and pertinent.

In keeping with the traditions of past national conventions, the Arizona BBA Planning Convention has encouraged delegations to create a report of the convention to their state. Georgia, Michigan and Minnesota, among others, are states whose delegates have provided a comprehensive assessment. We encourage them to submit their work to the above archives as well, and hope to preserve this work and encourage more national conventions on a variety of topics in the future.

Therefore, I include in the RECORD a report to Congress in regard to Arizona balanced budget amendment:

It is with great confidence that I believe each member of Congress possesses the same depth of gratitude for the work of our

Founding Fathers as those of us who attended this first fully authorized convention of states since the Civil War. We are all tasked with the grand responsibility to govern the people. In doing so, we reach with one hand into the future to focus on protecting the prosperity of our children's children, and with our other hand we reach to the past to learn and explore what happened so that we are better able to protect and preserve the vision of those who built this great Republic.

One such visionary was Col. George Mason, who insisted that the States should also be able to propose amendments to the Constitution. He imagined that there would come a time when the Legislatures would be called upon to take appropriate action, and that there ought to be a second mechanism to update our founding document should the need arise. This method has recently gained interest and popularity across the country, and for several years State Legislators have been examining the viability of such an exercise.

It can be legitimately argued that the time George Mason envisioned is before us. The momentum is increasing and the reality of an Article V Convention of States is becoming ever apparent. Greater Legislators than I were aware of the need to prepare the way in advance, and it has been an honor to join them in that effort. We hope to work together with Congress to restore fiscal accountability through the requirement of a balanced budget, and preparing a proposed set of rules for the Balanced Budget Amendment Convention is our gift to future delegates to make that process easier.

We present this report to you in hopes that you will consider the work that has been accomplished thus far. The Phoenix Correspondence Commission was created as an outgrowth of this convention, and as a founding member of that Commission, I look forward to beginning the conversation needed to prepare for the much-anticipated Article V Convention of States.

''We face the most predictable economic crisis in history.'' That was the conclusion of Erskine Bowles, co-chair of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform (Simpson-Bowles Commission), to the U.S. Senate Budget Committee on March 8, 2011. At the time of this ominous warning to the nation in 2011, the national debt had just eclipsed $14 trillion. It took 206 years for our nation to amass $1 trillion in debt; it has increased by over $6 trillion in the just the last seven years. Had Congress acted on the commission's proposal, it would have reduced the national debt by $4 trillion over a decade and put Social Security solidly on the road to solvency. Congress ignored this unequivocal national wake up call. ''The fiscal path we are on today is simply not sustainable,'' Bowles said. ''This debt and these deficits that we are incurring on an annual basis are like a cancer and they are going to truly destroy this country from within unless we have the common sense to do something about it.'' States are exercising the common sense to do something about it. Acting under Article V of the U.S. Constitution, 28 of the required 34 States have now called for a convention of states to propose a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in order to avert this ''most predictable economic crisis in history.'' In September of 2016, at the call of the Arizona Legislature, 19 States convened in their official capacity to propose rules for conducting an Article V balanced budget convention of states.

We call upon Congress, the States, and people of good faith everywhere to extend their utmost efforts to support this constitutional remedy for curing the national fiscal ''cancer'' before the exponentially increasing national debt ''destroy[s] this nation from within.''

The Phoenix convention was instructive in preparing for a future Article V BBA convention. We learned much about the process of communicating with the state legislatures and the need to continue to educate them on the logistics of a convention. We were encouraged from the manner in which the delegates conducted themselves that any future convention, like Phoenix, will stick to its task and never ''run away'' as Article V naysayers assert. The nature of delegate appointment process and the rules, in addition to numerous other safeguards, simply won't allow for it.

As a result of the Arizona convention, including the establishment of the Phoenix Correspondence Commission, the states as a group are positioned to assist Congress in counting the number of live Article V BBA applications in place, in assisting with identifying a time and location for a future BBA convention to be held, in addressing any legal issues which may arise concerning the calling of such a convention, in preparing language for an appropriate resolution to be passed by Congress fulfilling its mandatory obligation to call the convention when the threshold number of states have applied and to otherwise assist Congress in performing its duties pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution.

At present, twenty-eight (28) states have passed (and not rescinded) Article V applications calling for a convention to propose a balanced budget amendment. As we approach the two-thirds threshold triggering the call of a convention, we stand ready to work cooperatively with Congress in moving forward with this historic endeavor.

I authored the resolution calling for a Balanced Budget Amendment Planning Convention in Phoenix because I love this country. I believe it to be the greatest nation that has ever existed, but I am greatly concerned that our country is not on a sustainable fiscal path. Contrary to what some would like us to believe, the responsibility to get our fiscal house in order does not just rest with Congress, nor is Congress the end-all-be-all for governing this country.

In fact, a critical responsibility of the states in this great Union is in helping to keep our federal government in check. That value of Federalism was a bedrock principle that our Founding Fathers captured in the design of government put forth in the Constitution of the United States, over two centuries ago. I believe it is time for the states to start flexing our constitutional muscles, just as our Founding Fathers envisioned. And one vital tool for facilitating that, was instilled by our Founders in Article V of the Constitution. That is, the power of the states to propose amendments, especially as a means of constraining the power of the federal government. In 1798, then Vice President Thomas Jefferson, in correspondence with a state legislator, wrote, ''I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government; I mean an additional article taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing.'' While it might be more than two centuries late, I hope that soon we will be able to give President Jefferson his wish—for our own sake

All fifty state legislatures were invited to attend the Arizona BBA Planning Convention. The Arizona planning committee actively sought a delegation from each state and was fully inclusive in their efforts to host a bi-partisan event. HCR2022 specifically required that the delegations be chosen by resolution of the legislature or by formal joint appointment by the leadership in both houses of their respective state legislatures. This was to ensure that the delegation was authorized to speak and vote on behalf of their state Legislature. Delegates who were not listed on their State's approved delegation list were not seated. The meeting consisted of officially approved delegates from 19 state legislatures, with delegates from three additional states observing. Committees established to fulfill the requirements of HCR2022 were as follows: The Rules Drafting Committee; The Planning Committee, which was divided into two sub-committees: A Subcommittee on Ethics which was formed to address the impact and management of outside influence on the convention process and A Subcommittee on Delegates and Correspondence to assist in planning for a future BBA convention. A synopsis of the product of the Rules Committee is as follows: Produced a model set of rules for an Article V convention to propose a BBA. Some components of the set of model rules were as follows: The Article V convention shall be limited in scope to the balanced budget amendment. Governing rules provide for appropriate order and conduct during a BBA Article V convention which include, but are not limited to, the following: Duties of the officers. A quorum is a majority of the states in attendance. Each state shall be given only one vote, as has been the precedent in all preceding state conventions. Order of business and names of committees. The cost of the convention to be divided equally among the states in attendance.

A synopsis of the Planning Committee is as follows: Recommendations for protecting the integrity of an Article V Convention. Non-delegates should not be permitted on the Chamber Floor, Members' Lounge, etc., and should only be permitted in public areas. Any interaction of Convention leadership and staff with non-delegate individuals or organizations that pertains to Convention business or process should be strictly prohibited, with the exception of the press. Convention communications should only include official activities. States should consider extending their ethics restrictions (i.e. lobbying, food, gifts, etc.) to delegates serving within a convention, in addition to any ethics standards imposed by Convention rules. Sub-Committee on Delegates and Correspondence reported the following: In anticipation of the call for a convention for proposing amendments, states are strongly encouraged to enact delegate selection legislation at the earliest opportunity. The Phoenix Correspondence Commission (PCC) was created. The PCC will consist of commissioners appointed by the states to carry out the following functions to organize a convention for proposing amendments: Creating a single point of contact to act as a liaison with Congress. Track all applications for a convention for proposing amendments. Create a process to suggest to Congress a time and place for a convention for proposing amendments. Provide a process for legal representation, if necessary. Perform tasks as needed to organize the convention. Each state is strongly encouraged to appoint a commissioner to the PCC to communicate on all matters associated with a convention for proposing amendments with any or all of the following: State Legislators, United States Citizens, Convention Organizers, State Congressional Delegations, and Congress. The members of the PCC will be initially comprised of one member appointed from each delegation present at this Arizona Balanced Budget Amendment Planning Convention, until such time as each commissioner's state formally appoints a commissioner to the PCC or declines to do the same.

CONGRATULATING BRIGADIER GENERAL CHRISTOPHER FINERTY UPON HIS PROMOTION TO BRIGADIER GENERAL

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Brigadier General Christopher E. Finerty for his outstanding service to our country and congratulate him on his promotion to Brigadier General in the United States Air Force. General Finerty has worked closely with me, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and across Capitol Hill to inform and advise the Congress so that we may ensure a strong and ready National Guard. He has also helped the Pentagon work more productively with Congress, promoting a strong and efficient national defense.

General Finerty has done this work selflessly. He quietly, but tenaciously advocates for the Chief of the National Guard Bureau's priorities to make the National Guard a ready, capable force for operations m the homeland and overseas.

General Finerty's promotion grows from a career of accomplishments and experience. Prior to becoming the head of the National Guard Bureau's Office of Legislative Liaison, where he works directly for the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, General Finerty was Vice Commander of the Air National Guard Readiness Center and simultaneously the Commander of the 201st Mission Support Squadron, which together oversee personnel and policy across the country. He has previous tours in the National Guard Bureau's legislative liaison office, the Air Force congressional budget liaison office, and on the Air National Guard staff. He logged over 3,300 hours piloting HH–60 rescue helicopters and flew 45 combat missions. General Finerty is a 1992 graduate of the United States Air Force Academy.

General Finerty dedicates all of his time and energy to his work, with two exceptions—his children, Ryan and Kate. General Finerty's first priority are his children, and no father could be more devoted. Kate and Ryan inspire and strengthen him

Please join me in congratulating General Finerty on his well-earned promotion and in expressing our gratitude for his selfless service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Tuesday January 9, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 4581, H.R. 4564 and H. Res. 676.

MORE MONEY, LESS PROBLEMS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was grateful to learn that Tidewater Boats, led by Jimmy Metts, is investing $8.3 million to expand their manufacturing facility in Lexington, South Carolina. This investment will create 100 new jobs.

This news is on top of AFLAC announcing that they will be expanding their 700 employees in Columbia, South Carolina, managed by Daniel Lebish, and doubling their employee 401K matching funds.

On the same day Republicans passed historic tax cuts, AT&T led by Pam Lackey announced they are providing 200,000 employees a $1,000 bonus. Comcast, whose leader in South Carolina is Douglas Guthrie, will be providing $1,000 bonuses to 100,000 employees. BB&T, a valued corporate citizen led by Mike Brennan, will be raising their employee wages to $15 an hour and providing a $1,200 bonus for 27,000 employees.

Boeing of Charleston, led by Joan Robinson-Berry, announced they will be donating $100 million to charity that focuses on education, local communities, veterans and military personnel.

But the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is not only for businesses. I appreciate that next month, American families will see more of their own money in their paychecks.

In conclusion, God Bless our Troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

Best wishes to Chairman DARRELL ISSA and Kathy Issa for their dedicated service as they announce their retirement. We look forward to their continued service for the American people.

IN RECOGNITION OF A SUCCESSFUL IDAHO CONSERVATION PROGRAM

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important conservation program taking place in central Idaho that was created as part of the Sawtooth National Recreation Area and Jerry Peak Wilderness Additions Act. I also want to acknowledge the outstanding cooperation between Idaho conservationists and ranchers that have made this program a success.

The signing of the law in 2015 created three new wilderness areas totaling over 429 square miles. This jewel in the heart of Idaho was protected for future generations to enjoy. It also returned significant amounts of wilderness study areas back to multiple use allowing individuals and families to engage in outdoor and recreational activities for years to come.

When I began working on the Boulder-White Clouds bill nearly 20 years ago, ranchers on the East Fork of the Salmon River were facing significant headwinds to their traditional way of life. Lawsuits, federal regulations, and other obstacles were making it difficult to graze on their federal allotments. In many instances, their allotted animal unit months (AUMs) had been significantly reduced and in some cases completely eliminated. The trend going forward was not positive.

It became clear to me that providing opportunities for the ranching families to continue their livelihoods would be critical to a final outcome. A final bill would need to provide area ranchers with options that could help them reset their grazing operations and provide greater certainty for them in the future.

To meet this need, we developed a program in which area ranchers could voluntarily retire individual allotments that might not be economically viable to their ongoing ranching operations in exchange for compensation from a private third party.

This program specified that agreements were to be voluntary, that ranchers would be paid for all of the AUMs on their allotment and that funding would come from third party private entities and not the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to say that last month marked the completion of the initial phase of voluntary retirements.

In the past year, four families have retired five allotments and received over $1.35 million in private compensation. Some of these allotments were proving difficult to use and were marginally viable in their traditional operations. Through our program, the ranchers were paid for every AUM on each allotment.

On the conservation side, over 126,000 acres of pristine and ecologically important areas that include winter and summer range for elk and deer, important sage grouse habitat, and some of the highest elevation spawning habitat for ocean-going salmon and steelhead found anywhere will no longer be grazed. These were high conflict areas that have experienced past litigation and would probably see future litigation or regulation.

I am very pleased to say that the voluntary retirement program has been a success and a win for both the ranchers and for conservation. While the initial third party funding for the voluntary retirement program has expired, the mechanism still exists for ranchers to retire allotments in the future, should they so choose. In doing so, they will be free to enter into new agreements with new terms. These future agreements will be of their own accord between the ranchers and conservation interests.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the following organizations and individuals for their contributions to the voluntary retirement program.

The Idaho Conservation League were the backbone behind the voluntary grazing retirement program. The legislation provided the mechanism for the voluntary retirements and they provided the muscle, resources, and expertise to carry out this initial batch of retirements.

I want to give special thanks to Rick Johnson, the Executive Director of the Idaho Conservation League. Rick worked very closely with my staff and me as we developed the program. He made sure the grant funding was in place prior to passage of the legislation so that promises made to the ranchers would be kept after the bill became law. Rick has been a true friend and partner from start to finish in this process.

A very big thanks and well done go to John Robison, Public Lands Director of the Idaho

Conservation League. John facilitated each retirement from start to finish. He worked with multiple people and agencies and exhibited great professional skill and patience in getting each retirement completed. His outstanding work with various parties under short deadlines was critical to the success of this program.

I also want to thank the ranching families on the East Fork of the Salmon River. They are great people, who with their past generations, have made significant contributions to the region and to our country. When we first met together 17 years ago they told me their concerns and we came up with an idea of how we might go forward. They put their trust in me and I believe we came up with a plan to give them an opportunity to help put them in a better place. It has been a pleasure and honor to work with each family and I can proudly say that I believe the promises we made have been kept.

I would also like to recognize the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for their assistance in processing the retirements. In particular, I want to thank Kit Mullen, Sawtooth National Forest Supervisor; Kirk Flannigan, Sawtooth National Recreation Area Ranger; Andrea Cox, Supervisory Rangeland Management Specialist, Sawtooth National Forest; Ed Cannady, Recreation Manager, Sawtooth National Forest; Chuck Mark, Salmon-Challis National Forest Supervisor; Kurt Pindel, Challis-Yankee Fork District Ranger; Faith Ryan, Range and Weeds Program Lead, Salmon-Challis National Forest, Tim Murphy, BLM State Director (retired); and Todd Kuck, Field Manager, BLM Challis Field Office. They each did great work and we could not have completed the retirements without them.

Finally, I would like to note that without this voluntary grazing retirement program, the Boulder-White Clouds and Jerry Peak wilderness bills would never have become law. The program was a lynchpin to the compromise that allowed us to protect one of the most pristine areas of Idaho. It seems apparent that the cost of the program was small in comparison to the benefits that future generations will receive when they enjoy the remarkable beauty and serenity of the Boulder-White Clouds and Jerry Peak. We all owe a great deal of thanks to those who provided the resources for the program and to the ranchers who put their trust in allowing it to go forward.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF GEORGE DAVID JONES, II

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of George David Jones, II. David was a resident of the First District of Virginia and my hometown, Montross. David was a self-employed farmer who served the community as a member of the Westmoreland County Volunteer Fire Department. Additionally, David was a member of the Westmoreland Hunt Club, Virginia Dog Hunting Alliance, Pantico Run Hunt Club, and Eastern Virginia Young Farmers Association.

I had the pleasure of knowing David for many years and was a witness to his dedication to his family and community. David is survived by his partner, Alexandra Jones; sons, George David Jones, III and Jeffrey Flynn Jones. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you extend your thoughts and prayers to David's family and friends as they mourn the loss of their loved one. I pray that God is with David's family and friends during this difficult time.

SUPPORTING THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE OF IRAN TO FREE EXPRESSION

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my continued support for the people of Iran and continued support for freedom of speech as it is encapsulated in H. Res. 676, a resolution supporting the rights of the people of Iran to free expression and condemning the Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests.

On Sunday, January 7, 2018, I stood in protest with Iranian-Americans on the streets of Houston to take a stand for human rights in Iran.

At that event, I stated ''It is time for freedom to take over'' and I stand by that statement here in Congress and add that separation of church and state is essential for a free and democratic Iran.

On December 28, 2017, popular protests against the Iranian regime began in the city of Mashad and rapidly spread throughout the country, in the most significant antigovernment protests in Iran since June 2009.

The protesters have expressed numerous economic grievances, including the regime's widespread corruption and the Revolutionary Guard Corps' control of the country's economy.

Protesters have decried the regime's costly, destabilizing activities abroad, including its support for terrorist groups such as Hezbollah and the murderous Assad regime in Syria.

Reports indicate that more than 1,000 Iranians have been arrested and almost two dozen killed in connection with the protests.

The Iranian regime has shut down mobile internet access and has blocked and pressured companies to cut off social media applications used by activists to organize and publicize the protests.

Congress has provided authority to license the provision of communications technology to Iran to improve the ability of the Iranian people to speak freely.

I encourage the Administration to expedite the license of communications technology to Iran to improve the ability of the Iranian people to speak freely and I call on companies to reject requests by the regime to cut off the Iranian people from social media and other communications platforms.

On January 1, 2018, regime officials threatened to crack down, with Brigadier General Esmaeil Kowsari of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps stating, ''If this situation continues, the officials will definitely make some decisions and at that point this business will be finished.''

Congress has provided authority to designate and sanction elements of the Iranian regime involved in significant corruption and serious human rights abuses.

I urge the Administration to use targeted sanctions and work to convene emergency sessions of the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations Human Rights Council to condemn the ongoing human rights violations perpetrated by the Iranian regime and establish a mechanism by which the Security Council can monitor such violations.

Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps and its Basij militia have been sanctioned by the United States for planning and carrying out serious human rights abuses against the Iranian people, including for the cruel and prolonged torture of political dissidents, behavior that is absolutely intolerable.

The regime has routinely violated the human rights of Iranian citizens, including ongoing, systematic, and serious restrictions of freedom of peaceful assembly and association and freedom of opinion and expression, including the continuing closures of media outlets, arrests of journalists, and the censorship of expression in online forums such as blogs and websites.

The Department of State's 2016 Human Rights Report on Iran noted:

> severe restrictions on civil liberties, including the freedoms of assembly, association, speech, religion, and press.
>
> Other human rights problems included abuse of due process combined with use of capital punishment for crimes that do not meet the requirements of due process, as well as cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment; and disregard for the physical integrity of persons, whom authorities arbitrarily and unlawfully detained, tortured, or killed.

For a country that once enjoyed great pride in its freedom of thought, the information in this Report comes with sadness.

On December 29, 2017, the Department of State strongly condemned the arrest of peaceful protesters and noted that ''Iran's leaders have turned a wealthy country with a rich history and culture into an economically depleted rogue state whose chief exports are violence, bloodshed, and chaos.''

On January 1, 2018, the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom, Boris Johnson, stated that:

> The UK is watching events in Iran closely.
>
> We believe that there should be meaningful debate about the legitimate and important issues the protesters are raising and we look to the Iranian authorities to permit this.

On January 2, 2018, the French Foreign Ministry stated that:

> French authorities are closely monitoring the situation in Iran.
>
> Demonstrating freely is a fundamental right.
>
> The same is true for the free movement of information.
>
> France expresses its concern over the large number of victims and arrests.

On January 1, 2018, a spokesman for the Canadian Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated that:

> We call on the Iranian authorities to uphold and respect democratic and human rights and ''We are encouraged by the Iranian people who are bravely exercising their basic right to protest peacefully.
>
> Canada will continue to support the fundamental rights of the Iranians, including freedom of expression.

As hypocrisy has it, Iran is a member of the United Nations, voted for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and is a signatory to

the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, among other international human rights treaties.

In violation of these and other international obligations, Iranian regime officials continue to violate the fundamental human rights of the Iranian people.

Today, I rise with my colleagues in Congress to stand with the people of Iran that are engaged in legitimate and peaceful protests against an oppressive, corrupt regime.

I rise in support of H. Res. 676 which condemns the Iranian regime's serious human rights abuses against the Iranian people, significant corruption, and destabilizing activities abroad.

I call on all democratic governments and institutions to clearly support the Iranian people's right to live in a free society.

I rise to urge the Iranian regime to abide by its international obligations with respect to human rights and civil liberties, including freedoms of assembly, speech, and press.

The Iranian regime must do the right thing and respect the proud history and rich culture of the Iranian nation.

The people of Iran want nothing more than to promote the establishment of basic freedoms that build the foundation for the emergence of a freely elected, open, and democratic political system.

I whole-heartedly support H. Res. 676 and continue fighting for a free Iran.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 2, YEA on Roll Call No. 3, and YEA on Roll Call No. 4.

TO RECOGNIZE JAMES B. HOWARD ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE KING GEORGE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. James B. Howard, a citizen of King George County and Virginia's First District, on his retirement from the King George County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Howard served his community well as a member of the Board of Supervisors for the James Monroe District from 1976 to 1978. Additionally, Mr. Brown served as a member of the King George County School Board from 1988 to 1991, and the County Supervisor for the James Monroe District from 2000 to 2009 and 2014 to 2017.

During his tenure, Mr. Howard furthered the education of our youth through leading the development of Sealston Elementary School, construction of the new King George High School, the expansion of the King George Middle School, and renovation of the Potomac Elementary School, in addition to other leadership successes. Mr. Howard served as the Chairman of the King George County Board of Supervisors for multiple terms and dedicated 21 years to serving the county in local government.

I would like to thank Mr. Howard for his many contributions throughout his 21-year career. I wish him and his wife, Sheila, the best of luck in their future endeavors.

IN MEMORY OF CLIFF EVERTS

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memorial to a dedicated husband, proud father, pioneer of aviation and entrepreneurship, and importantly, a great Alaskan. On December 7, 2017, Alaska lost one if its hardest working and most dedicated fathers, Mr. Cliff Everts.

Cliff Everts is a keepsake original forged from rare earth. He matriculated from New York but had the spirit of an Alaskan Wolf, the business acumen of a Rockefeller, and the fortitude of a Sourdough. His smile could light up a room and his sense of humor warmed any room he happened to grace. In thinking of that astounding smile and infectious laugh, I am reminded of one of his famous quotes and something he said the last time I saw him "Dude, that was sick!" It's how he lived his life.

In reflecting upon Cliff's many accomplishments and his life, one could go on for days about all he did. I can speak to his service to his customers and how he always found a way to deliver cargo ranging from reindeer to homebuilding materials (beat that Home Depot), or start a business to sell ice cream to Alaskans! He did so at the best price with the best service to those customers. I can speak to all of his service to the community. How much he cared for Alaskans and loved Alaska.

However, what gives me the most pleasure and puts a massive smile on my face, is Cliff's dedication and his love for his wife and six children. Whenever anyone asked what made Cliff happy or what made Cliff such a success, it was always his family. He always shined when he talked about them and you could see how he would glow whenever he thought about them or saw them in person. You just do not find that in most people but you always knew it with Cliff.

Suffice to say that Cliff will live in infamy in our hearts and souls. I hope that Cliff's family and especially his wife Betty can take comfort in the bond they have with him; always. I hope the precious memories the family has of their precious Cliff will one day bring them comfort, and that they will come to find, in the lovely words of Hugh Orr:

"They are not dead who live in lives they leave behind. In those whom they have blessed, they live a life again, and shall live through the years eternal life, and shall grow each day more beautiful, as time declares their good, forgets the rest, and proves their immortality."

Please join me in expressing our heartfelt appreciation for Cliff and our sympathies for his wife, Betty; son, Robert Everts and his wife Paula; his daughters, Melanie Moyer; Debbie Baggen; Karen Wing; Vicki Parrish and her husband Albert; and Susan Hoshaw and her husband Don; 16 grandchildren; 11 great-grandchildren; and so many close, cherished family and friends.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably absent Tuesday afternoon, January 9, on very urgent family medical business. Had I been present for three votes which occurred,

I would have voted "Aye" on H. Res. 676, Roll call vote No. 2;

I would have voted "Aye" on H.R. 4564, Roll call vote No. 3; and

I would have voted "Aye" on H.R. 4581, Roll call vote No. 4.

TRIBUTE TO NORMA AND ROY BULLOCK

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Norma and Roy Bullock of Creston, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on November 3, 2017.

Norma and Roy's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO DONNA AND ROGER CANDEE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Donna and Roger Candee of Carlisle, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They celebrated on November 9, 2017.

Donna and Roger's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO THE DOWLING CATHOLIC FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Dowling Catholic High School football team for their fifth straight state title at this year's 4A Iowa High School Football Championships.

Members of the team include: Jayson Murray, Michael Keough, Zach Wafters, Lucas Paskach, Marcus Miller, Connor Jackman, Sam Ingoli, Quentin Wellmaker, Ashton Brown, Jack Keough, Spencer Smith, Zach Prey, Blake Clark, Jonas Thompson, Austin Knoblach, Brandon Waechter, Max Bocken, Owen Shiltz, Matt Moore, John Schmidt, Connor Ibach, Drew Peterson, Ryan Adam, Chase Hauschilt, Colton Sanders, Teagan Johnson, Xavier Chiodo, Malik McGregor, Joe Scavo, Josh Paskach, Andrew Feltz, Drake Rupperecht, Grant Jameson, Michael Rodriguez, Nick Bordenaro, Deng Kodak, Jack Bertram, Mitchell Riggs, Drew Snedegar, Max Beh, Daniel Critelli, Levi Hummel, Christian Ousley, Christian Firestine, Adam Topping, Nate Collins, Nolan Sinnott, Nate Rea, Alex Kirton, Anthony Scavo, Mitch Goff, Matt English, Riley Fitzpatrick, Sean Pallardy, Zach Calvert, Ben Means, Greg Hagen, Tom Nolan, Michael Ortega, Tom Derry, Adam Kroll, Wyatt Grubb, Sean Pattschull, Zach Ross, Tyler Holmes, Charlie Nank, Nick Leon, Jesse Alger, Charlie Johnson, Jack Lyman, Anthony Coppola, Matt Stillwell, Zach Roering, Collin Cook, Mason Heckman, Jack Rude, Connor Kriegshauser, Rex Kromkowski, Zach Stacy, John Waggoner, Jake Calvert, Jack Scholz, Reilly Smidt.

Coaches: Tom Wilson, Jim Williams, Grant Bousum, Jay Campbell, Craig McClain, Adam Jack, Andy Pollock, Jeff Motz, Fred Tiernan, Ryan Van Veen, Aundra Meeks.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent these remarkable players, coaches and school in the United States House of Representatives. Their months of hard work culminated in this remarkable achievement. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating them for winning this year's 4A Iowa High School Football Championship and in wishing them all nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO KATE CUTLER AND BOYD LITTRELL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Kate Cutler and Boyd Littrell of Council Bluffs, Iowa for receiving the Jason Award, given by Children's Square U.S.A. The award is presented to individuals, couples, organizations, and businesses that exemplify and demonstrate an extraordinary degree of caring, contribution, and commitment to children, families, and their communities.

Kate and Boyd have been committed to strengthening families and their community through their personal activities. Kate's willingness to give her time and talents to a variety of organizations has been of great benefit to the Council Bluffs community, and Boyd's commitment to helping those that cannot help themselves has not gone unnoticed. These two Iowans are excellent examples as to what makes our great state such an extraordinary place to live.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Kate and Boyd for receiving the Jason Award for their contributions and commitment to the Council Bluffs community. I am proud to represent them in the United States Congress and I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Kate and Boyd and in wishing them nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO SHERYL AND LEROY LESTER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Sheryl and LeRoy Lester of Council Bluffs, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They married on November 8, 1957 at United Methodist Church in Council Bluffs.

Sheryl and LeRoy's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them nothing but the best.

TRIBUTE TO CHRIS HOCHSTETLER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Chris Hochstetler of Council Bluffs, Iowa for receiving the Jason Award, given by Children's Square U.S.A. The award is presented to individuals, couples, organizations and businesses that exemplify and demonstrate an extraordinary degree of caring, contribution, and commitment to children, families, and their communities.

Chris received this honor for his vision, courage, and will in his personal and professional life. Chris grew up in Nebraska and graduated from Grand Island High School. He holds a Bachelor's of Science degree from the University of Maryland and a Master's degree from Walden University. After high school Chris joined the U.S. Army and had a distinguished military career, receiving the Legion of Merit, our nation's sixth highest military honor. Chris is also active in several community and nonprofit organizations including serving as the Executive Director of KANEKO, an arts and culture nonprofit that provides world class exhibitions, programs, and workshops.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Chris for receiving this outstanding award and I am proud to recognize him today. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO DONNA AND RON MARTIN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Donna and Ron Martin of Greenfield, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on October 28, 2017.

Donna and Ron's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO DONNABELLE AND MARVIN REYNOLDS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Donnabelle and Marvin Reynolds of Redfield, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on November 10, 2017.

Donnabelle and Marvin's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous

occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO BARB AND LARRY WYNN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Barb and Larry Wynn of Creston, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary.

Barb and Larry's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO AMY HOFFMANN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Amy Hoffmann of Avoca, Iowa for her selection as the 2017 Parent Educator of the Year by the Parents as Teachers National Center. The award was presented at the Teachers International Conference in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Amy is a Parent Educator for FAMILY, Inc.

The Parent Educator of the Year award is given to those who exemplify the practices and mission of Parents as Teachers. FAMILY, Inc., and Parents as Teachers work together to provide public health and family support services for women, children, and families in Pottawattamie and Mills County. Amy has been involved with this program for 18 years and through her service she has provided 4,586 family visits, assisted 165 families and touched the lives of 298 children. Amy said she finds ways to get families involved in the community by offering social and group connections, which help build relationships. "This award is an honor to our community and no one is more deserving of this award than Amy" stated Jean Bohnker, Director of Early Childhood and Family Support Services at FAMILY, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Amy for receiving this outstanding award. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Amy for receiving this award and in wishing her nothing but continued success in all her future endeavors.

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, January 11, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 16

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the domestic and global energy outlook from the perspective of the International Energy Agency.

SD–366

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Homeland Security.

SH–216

JANUARY 17

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Jerome H. Powell, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine combating money laundering and other forms of illicit finance, focusing on Administration perspectives on reforming and strengthening Bank Secrecy Act enforcement.

SD–538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine terrorism and social media.

SR–253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Water and Power

To hold hearings to examine the Bureau of Reclamation's title transfer process and potential benefits to Federal and non-Federal stakeholders.

SD–366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine America's water infrastructure needs and challenges, focusing on Federal panel perspectives.

SD–406

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Dennis Shea, of Virginia, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Geneva Office), with the rank of Ambassador, and C. J. Mahoney, of Kansas, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Investment, Services, Labor, Environment, Africa, China, and the Western Hemisphere), with the rank of Ambassador.

SD–215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine facing 21st century public health threats, focusing on our nation's preparedness and response capabilities.

SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Medicaid and the opioid epidemic, focusing on unintended consequences.

SD–342

2 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the state of the Department of Veterans Affairs, focusing on a progress report on implementing 2017 Department of Veterans Affairs reform legislation.

SR–418

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine breaking new ground in agribusiness opportunities in Indian Country.

SD–628

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism

To hold hearings to examine the long-term care needs of first responders injured in the line of duty.

SD–226

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S113–S142

Measures Introduced: Eight bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2285–2292, and S. Res. 371. **Page S138**

Measures Reported:

S. 1693, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–199) **Page S138**

Measures Passed:

Universal Service Fund Filing Requirements: Senate passed S. 875, to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit a report on filing requirements under the Universal Service Fund programs, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S141–42**

Brown Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia. **Pages S124–42**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 97 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 6), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S124**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 12 noon, on Thursday, January 11, 2018, all post-cloture time on the nomination be considered expired, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination of Michael Lawrence Brown, with no intervening action or debate; and that if cloture is invoked on the nomination of Walter David Counts III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, all post-cloture time be considered expired at 1:45 p.m., and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination of Walter David Counts III, with no intervening action or debate. **Page S127**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, January 11, 2018. **Page S142**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. EX. 5), Thomas Lee Robinson Parker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee. **Pages S124, S142**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Paul C. Ney, Jr., of Tennessee, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Holly W. Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Environmental Protection Agency. **Page S142**

Messages from the House: **Page S138**

Measures Referred: **Page S138**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S138–39**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S139–41**

Additional Statements: **Page S137**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S141**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S141**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—6) **Page S124**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:42 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 11, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S142.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Airland: Senators Cotton (Chair), Inhofe, Wicker, Tillis, Sullivan, Cruz, Sasse, King, McCaskill, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Warren, and Peters.

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity: Senators Rounds (Chair), Fischer, Perdue, Graham, Sasse, Nelson, McCaskill, Gillibrand, and Blumenthal.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Senators Ernst (Chair), Wicker, Fischer, Perdue, Cruz, Heinrich, Nelson, Shaheen, and Peters.

Subcommittee on Personnel: Senators Tillis (Chair), Ernst, Graham, Sasse, Gillibrand, McCaskill, and Warren.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support: Senators Inhofe (Chair), Rounds, Ernst, Perdue, Scott, Kaine, Shaheen, and Hirono.

Subcommittee on SeaPower: Senators Wicker (Chair), Cotton, Rounds, Tillis, Sullivan, Scott, Hirono, Shaheen, Blumenthal, Kaine, and King.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Senators Fischer (Chair), Inhofe, Cotton, Sullivan, Cruz, Graham, Donnelly, Heinrich, Warren, and Peters.

Senators McCain and Reed are ex-officio members of each subcommittee.

AMERICA'S WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine America's water infrastructure needs and challenges, after receiving testimony from Senator Cassidy; Nicole T. Carter, Specialist in Natural Resources Policy, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Scott Robinson, Port of Muskogee, Fort Gibson, Oklahoma; Julie A. Ufner, National Association of Counties, and Steve Cochran, Restore the Mississippi River Delta, both of Washington, D.C.; and William D. Friedman, Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority, Alexandria, Virginia, on behalf of the American Association of Port Authorities.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Kurt D. Engelhardt, of Louisiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, and Barry W. Ashe, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, who were introduced by Senator Cassidy, Howard C. Nielson, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, and James R. Sweeney II, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana, who was introduced by Senators Donnelly and Young, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 16 public bills, H.R. 4750–4765; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 683 were introduced. **Pages H131–32**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H132–33**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 3548, to make certain improvements to the security of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–505, Part 1);

H.R. 2504, to ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms (H. Rept. 115–506, Part 1);

S. 1285, to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands (H. Rept. 115–507);

H.R. 453, to deem the Step 2 compliance date for standards of performance for new residential wood heaters, new residential hydronic heaters, and forced-air furnaces to be May 15, 2023 (H. Rept. 115–508); and

H.R. 1917, to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule (H. Rept. 115–509). **Page H131**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Smith (NE) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H85**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:51 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H90**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 178 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 13. **Pages H91, H125–26**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Espaillat motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 51 yeas to 331 nays, Roll No. 5. **Page H92**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Gutiérrez motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 54 yeas to 311 nays, Roll No. 6. **Page H94**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Grijalva motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 62 yeas to 324 nays, Roll No. 7. **Page H95**

Rapid DNA Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 682, providing for consideration of the bill (S. 139) to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, and to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 8, after the previous question was ordered without objection. **Page H111**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, January 11th. **Page H114**

Amending the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund: The House passed S. 140, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund, by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 173 noes, Roll No. 11. **Pages H124–25**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–54 shall be considered as adopted. **Page H114**

H. Res. 681, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (S. 140) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 10, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 9. **Pages H113–14**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, January 9th.

Department of Homeland Security Overseas Personnel Enhancement Act: H.R. 4567, amended, to require a Department of Homeland Security overseas personnel enhancement plan, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 415 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 12. **Page H125**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Seven yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H92, H94, H95, H111, H113, H113–14, H124–25, H125, and H125–26. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Committee Meetings

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE UPDATE ON THE FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND AUDIT REMEDIATION (FIAR) PLAN

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Department of Defense Update on the Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation (FIAR) Plan". Testimony was heard from David Norquist, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Defense.

A FURTHER EXAMINATION OF FEDERAL RESERVE REFORM PROPOSALS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled "A Further Examination of Federal Reserve Reform Proposals". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SANCTIONS AND FINANCIAL PRESSURE: MAJOR NATIONAL SECURITY TOOLS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Sanctions and Financial Pressure: Major National Security Tools". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

UPCOMING ELECTIONS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE: IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. POLICY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled "Upcoming Elections in the Western Hemisphere: Implications for U.S. Policy". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 506, the "Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2017"; and ratification of subcommittee assignments. Subcommittee assignments were ratified. H.R. 506 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 219, the "Swan Lake Hydroelectric Project Boundary Correction Act"; H.R. 801, the "Route 66 National Historic Trail Designation Act"; H.R. 1220, to establish the Adams Memorial Commission to carry out the provisions of Public Law 107–62, and for other purposes; H.R. 2711, the "National Memorial to Fallen Educators Act"; H.R. 3133, the "Streamlining Environmental Approvals Act of 2017"; and S. 117, the "Alex Diekmann Peak Designation Act of 2017". H.R. 219, H.R. 3133, and S. 117 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 801, H.R. 1220, and H.R. 2711 were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4675, the "Low Dose Radiation Research Act of 2017". H.R. 4675 was ordered reported, as amended.

HOME LOAN CHURNING PRACTICES AND HOW VETERAN HOMEBUYERS ARE BEING AFFECTED

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled "Home Loan Churning Practices and How Veteran Homebuyers are Being Affected". Testimony was heard from Jeffrey London, Director, Loan Guaranty Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D15)*

H.R. 560, to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Signed on January 8, 2018. (Public Law 115–101)

H.R. 1242, to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission. Signed on January 8, 2018. (Public Law 115–102)

H.R. 1306, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon. Signed on January 8, 2018. (Public Law 115–103)

H.R. 1927, to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish within the National Park Service the African American Civil Rights Network. Signed on January 8, 2018. (Public Law 115–104)

S. 1393, to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses. Signed on January 8, 2018. (Public Law 115–105)

S. 1532, to disqualify from operating a commercial motor vehicle for life an individual who uses a commercial motor vehicle in committing a felony involving human trafficking. Signed on January 8, 2018. (Public Law 115–106)

S. 1766, to reauthorize the SAFER Act of 2013. Signed on January 8, 2018. (Public Law 115–107)

H.R. 267, to redesignate the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site in the State of Georgia. Signed on January 8, 2018. (Public Law 115–108)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine United States policy in Syria post-ISIS, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 2152, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for assistance for victims of child pornography, and the nominations of Stuart Kyle Duncan, of Louisiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, Annemarie Carney Axon, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, R. Stan Baker, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia, Jeffrey Uhlman Beaverstock, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama, Liles Clifton Burke, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Thomas Alvin Farr, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina, Charles Barnes Goodwin, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, Michael Joseph Juneau, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, Matthew J. Kacsmaryk, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Emily Coody Marks, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, Terry Fitzgerald Moorer, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama, Mark Saalfield Norris, Sr., to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, William M. Ray II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, Eli Jeremy Richardson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee, Holly Lou Teeter, to be United States District Judge for the District of Kansas,

and Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, Jeffrey Bossert Clark, of Virginia, and Eric S. Dreiband, of Maryland, each to be an Assistant Attorney General, Joseph D. Brown, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas, Matthew D. Krueger, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Norman Euell Arflack, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and Ted G. Kamatchus, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Iowa, all of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, January 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 12 noon.

Following disposition of the nomination of Michael Lawrence Brown, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Walter David Counts III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas. If cloture is invoked on the nomination, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, January 11

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of S. 139—FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E25
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga, E29
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E22
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E24
Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E25
Cheney, Liz, Wyo., E23, E25
DelBene, Suzan K., Wash., E21
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E25
Duffy, Sean, P., Wisc., E23
Foster, Bill, Ill., E22
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E24
Gosar, Paul, Ariz., E25
Gowdy, Trey, S.C., E21
Granger, Kay, Tex., E27
Green, Gene, Tex., E23
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E28
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E24
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E27
Perry, Scott, Pa., E24
Raskin, Jamie, Md., E21
Renacci, James B., Ohio, E29
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E22
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E27
Smith, Adam, Wash., E23
Valadao, David G., Calif., E21
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E27
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E28, E29
Young, David, Iowa, E29, E29, E30, E30, E30, E30, E30, E30, E31, E31
Young, Don, Alaska, E29

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.