United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 2018 No. 11

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 18, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RON ESTES 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.

FUND OUR TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, here we are again, having to vote on a continuing resolution instead of a full-year appropriations deal because of political reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled that much-needed defense dollars are once again being held hostage for political reasons. We have heard time and again from military leaders about the devastating readiness crisis plaguing every corner of the military. We have planes that cannot fly, troops that cannot deploy, and we are literally running out of bombs.

It is irresponsible and morally wrong to send our troops into harm's way without adequate resources and training. Last year alone, there were 80 deaths related to readiness and training accidents. It is clear that insufficient and unreliable funding is wearing our military to the bone and costing precious lives.

As Members of Congress, we have the power of the purse. We can relieve the military from this deadly cycle. I call on my colleagues to end the political games. Support the men and women in uniform who risk their lives every day to defend this country. Support a budget agreement that provides our servicemembers with the funding they so desperately need.

SYRIA: ENOUGH ALREADY

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn in the strongest possible terms the ongoing, unrelenting attacks against civilians in Syria committed by the barbaric, lawless regime of Bashir al-Assad, with Russian backing.

We have all heard the statistics over and over again like a broken record: as many as half a million people killed since the armed conflict began in March 2011, tens of thousands of them civilians; tens of thousands more detained, disappeared, and perhaps, or even likely, dead, directly at the hands of the regime; more than 11 million people displaced once and again, inside and outside of Syria's borders, the largest single refugee crisis the world has seen since 1945. More than half of those displaced are children and youth.

Last summer, much was made of the cease-fire agreement that the Trump administration reached with the Russian Government to establish ''deescalation zones'' to stabilize Syria, while keeping the Assad regime in power.

We were told the agreement would save lives. Trump said: ''. . . all of a sudden, you are going to have no bullets being fired in Syria. . . .''

Well, that has turned out not to be true. The deescalation zones are not deescalating.

As of late December, more than 400,000 people remain trapped, besieged by regime forces in eastern Ghouta, one of the deescalation zones, only half an hour's drive from Damascus.

As U.N. Special Adviser on Syria Jan Egeland said last December: ''There is no deescalation zone, there is only escalation in this deescalation zone.''

Idlib, another ''deescalation area,'' suffered a dramatic increase in air attacks last September against armed groups not covered by the cease-fire agreement. In late December, airstrikes and shelling against a hospital, a medical warehouse, and a vegetable market killed, injured, and displaced scores of people.

The U.S. Government heralded the military defeat of ISIS in Syria in November. But the defeat of ISIS has not and will not end the Syrian conflict; and Russia has not succeeded in pressuring Assad to end the conflict, nor in restraining Assad's attacks on civilians as he has gone after rebel forces.

Meanwhile, the humanitarian situation in Syria deteriorates each and every day. World Vision estimatesthat 5.6 million people are in need of acute humanitarian assistance. The U.N. says a total of 13.1 million people need some form of assistance. That is 3 million more than at the end of 2016. The situation is worse today, after months of deescalation, than it was a year ago.

Of those 13 million, 3 million are trapped in besieged and hard-to-reach areas. That is 4½ times the population of Boston or Washington, D.C.

Printed on recycled paper.

Humanitarian access to those areas is not guaranteed by the regime, nor by its backers; international law and obligations be damned.

Some of the most heartbreaking news out of Syria has to do with the crisis in healthcare. The ''weaponization'' of healthcare in Syria is not new, but the depravity of it all still shocks me. According to a recent report by researchers at the American University in Beirut, ''Syria has become the most dangerous place on earth for healthcare providers.''

According to the International Rescue Committee, in 2011, there was one doctor per 600 people in Syria. But now, in east Ghouta, there is only one doctor per 3,600 people.

Medical supplies are not allowed into besieged areas and terribly ill patients are not allowed out.

What military or political purpose is served by denying medical evacuation to women and children suffering from heart disease, cancer, kidney failure, and blood diseases?

Mr. Speaker, current policy is not working to end the crisis in Syria. It is time to change course, not by sending more Special Forces troops there without any authorization, nor by promising to keep them there indefinitely to fight against the next iteration of ISIS.

What we need is to reassert American diplomatic leadership and exert real pressure to end the war. We need a plan to transition Assad out of power. We need to pass H. Res. 632, condemning the senseless attacks on hospitals and medical personnel in Syria.

We need to shame Russia for its failure to ensure humanitarian access. We need to increase our contributions to humanitarian assistance for Syria and make full use of the option of cross-border assistance.

We need to open our hearts to the Syrian refugees and welcome more of them to our country. We need to do everything in our power to lay the groundwork to ensure accountability for Assad's victims. That includes funding the international, impartial, and independent mechanism to assist in the investigation and prosecution of war crimes.

The Syrian conflict has gone on far too long. The horror of it all can be mind-numbing, but we must not lose our outrage. Now is the time to reenergize our efforts and find a way to end the suffering.

STANDING FOR THE UNBORN

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, more than 100,000 Americans will travel from across the country to take part in the world's largest pro-life event right here in the Nation's Capital.

The theme for the 45th annual March for Life is ''Love Saves Lives.'' This embodies the true spirit and mission of the pro-life movement by enlisting the power of love to empower others to choose life.

Since the Supreme Court issued a decision in Roe v. Wade, tens of millions of abortion procedures have been performed throughout the United States. Although consistent attempts to overturn this decision have fallen short over the past 4 decades, support for Federal pro-life policies has remained strong.

We will witness this strength Friday when Americans from all corners of the country will march on Washington to highlight the progress of the pro-life movement and encourage strong support moving forward.

President Trump will address the marchers from the Rose Garden and show his commitment to protecting the unborn. He is the first sitting U.S. President to address the event via satellite from the White House in the event's 45-year history.

President Trump has remained steadfast in his commitment to advance pro-life policy. One of his first actions in 2017 was an executive order reinstating the Mexico City policy, which bars international nongovernmental organizations that perform or promote abortions from receiving funding from the U.S. Government. This action, first instated by President Reagan in 1984, helps ensure that taxpayer dollars are not used to fund abortions overseas.

Members of this House also passed H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2017, just 1 day after President Trump reinstated the Mexico City policy. This bill made permanent some longstanding policies that prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars to fund abortion, such as the Hyde amendment.

H.R. 7 also helps to ensure that health insurance companies remain accountable to consumers by requiring them to fully disclose whether or not their healthcare plans cover abortion services.

Another pro-life victory that passed the House in October was H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This bill outlaws abortions performed after the 20-week postfertilization period.

I have consistently voted to prohibit late-term abortions and to protect the unborn, and I will continue to do so as long as I am serving in the House. We must always demonstrate a strong commitment to protecting the lives of the defenseless.

The House will continue the fight this week. On Friday, we will vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This means that, in the case of a child born alive during an attempted abortion, that child must be immediately transported and admitted to a hospital. If a baby born alive is left to die, the penalty can be up to 5 years in jail. I will certainly vote in support of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, abortion is a tragedy not just because an innocent child died, but because of the lasting impact the abortion itself had on the mothers of those children.

We continue to see efforts by the pro-life movement making an impact. Data shows that the annual number of abortions performed in this country is in decline, including my State of Pennsylvania. There are legislative efforts across the country to protect unborn children and provide assistance and hope to their mothers. These efforts are one of the keys to ending abortion in the U.S.

Pro-life education is having an impact on our culture and in the lives of women facing unexpected pregnancies, but there is much still to be done. That is why I look forward to participating in the 45th annual March for Life, where we will redouble our commitment to protecting the sanctity of human life in all phases and conditions. Attendees will hear stories of love, courage, and victory through God's mercy and grace.

Mr. Speaker, human life is sacred and, through education, love can protect the most vulnerable. The pro-life movement is a voice for the voiceless, and I am incredibly proud and honored to be a part of it.

GENERAL KELLY'S DEFINITION OF BIPARTISANSHIP

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I had an interesting meeting yesterday with General Kelly. Twenty-five Members of Congress, almost all of whom are descendants of immigrants who came here with nothing, whose parents came here with nothing, sat down with the Chief of Staff of the President of the United States. He said, basically, that we are the wrong kind of people in America, and that people like our parents who came here to this country really are bringing the country down. Because when he says he is for a merit-based system, he is saying he is not for my mom and my dad being able to come to this country.

But interestingly enough, all of us who came to this country because of a family-based immigration system wound up as being Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

But he was saying: You know, I am meeting with a group of Congressmen, and you really shouldn't be here because your parents really are tearing the country apart and bringing it down.

That is what he means when he says: I want to replace the system with a merit-based system.

And that was very telling in the meeting yesterday.

But, you know, we want a system that is family-based. That is the system the Democrats want because we believe that businesses are created by

immigrants and that it is essential for their families to be united as they come to this country so that they can achieve American success and we can all achieve the American Dream together.

That is exactly what they want to stop with the merit-based system; unless, of course, they come from Norway, then they continue to come.

We hear from the party of family values and the party of Donald Trump, who even employs his children at the White House. The Trump Organization, just think about. Here is an organization where the dad created the business, handed it down to the son. The son is now going to hand it down to his children. But they don't want immigrants to be able to do exactly the same thing and follow the same course that, apparently, has been so successful for the President of the United States.

Here is something else we learned from the Chief of Staff: when people from one party work with people from another party, that is not bipartisanship, he said. Bipartisanship, defined by General Kelly and this White House, is when people with completely different, opposite views of the world work together.

So only a Senate deal between people who believe in immigration and those who don't believe in immigration and who want to end our immigration system as it is, unless you come from Norway, that is the only way it is bipartisanship. That is like saying that if a Republican and Democrat are working together on an environmental issue, it is not bipartisanship because it is a Republican and Democrat, unless the Democrat and the Republican are persons who believe in climate change, working together with a Republican who believes that climate change is a hoax created by the Chinese.

□ 1015

Do you know what kind of legislation you get? You get nothing. You get a stalemate. You do not move the agenda forward. But that is their bipartisanship, and that is what we learned at the meeting yesterday.

Look, Democrats and Republicans are working together—Senator GRAHAM, Republican; Senator DURBIN, Democrat. They put a proposal on the table, and the President rejected it. That includes, just so that we are very clear, Democrats giving up things that are unprecedented in that Senate deal that was put on the President's desk.

Members of the Hispanic Caucus meeting with General Kelly can't fathom supporting the Senate deal. But guess what. That is bipartisanship. That is what it comes down to, which brings us to the votes this week.

Republicans might not need our help because you are the majority party, we are the minority party. But just in case you do need our help in getting a budget approved, I want you to know we are ready to stand to help you to keep the government open and to approve a budget.

But what I learned from the meeting with General Kelly, and everybody should understand, is that Democrats are more united than ever before. If you want our help on the budget, you have got to release the 800,000 DREAMers you are holding hostage. You have got to do it. Democrats aren't going to blink. We are going to stand by our values.

There comes a time that, if you say you stand for justice, you have to actually take a stand and hold it and not back down, and that is what Democrats are going to do this week. We are not going to back down.

Need our help? Release the 800,000 DREAMers you hold hostage. And guess what. We are ready to pay a handsome ransom for their release.

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

SAVE THE POLITICAL THEATER FOR ANOTHER DAY

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great frustration with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their reckless behavior that is threatening the safety and security of the American people.

Let me explain. Some Members of the House and Senate are holding funding for the Federal Government, including funding for our Nation's military, hostage in an effort to advance their immigration agenda.

I understand that immigration is a very important issue. I have many priorities in the immigration debate myself, like increased border security. But I understand that there will come a time and a place to debate immigration issues. That time is not now, and that place is not on a bill dealing with funding our military and other essential functions of government.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the American people hate about Congress. Instead of simply doing one of our most basic jobs, funding the government, we are having an unrelated debate about an immigration issue.

Let's be clear about what is going on here. Congressional Democrats are using our military men and women as pawns in a political game. They think they can use funding for the military as leverage to get their way on a very complex immigration issue. I think that is not only wrong. I think it is irresponsible and it has very grave consequences.

I want to strongly reject the notion that this is a Republican problem. The House passed a bill back in September, over 4 months ago, to fund the military and the entire Federal Government. That bill has been stuck in the Senate, where 60 votes are necessary to pass the bill. There are only 51 Republican Senators, so that means it will be necessary to have bipartisan support to get any bill across the finish line. I vehemently reject this is an issue just facing congressional Republicans. Frankly, that is a lie.

So why am I so passionate about this issue? Because our Nation's military is facing a serious readiness crisis, and we as the Congress are making things worse. We have the smallest Army since before World War II, the smallest Navy since before World War I, and the smallest and oldest Air Force we have ever had.

General Daniel Allyn, vice chief of staff for the Army, put it best when he said the budgetary problems have ''left the Army outranged, outgunned, and outdated. As a result, the Army risks falling behind countries like Russia and China.''

There are similarly alarming quotes from the other services as well. Our military needs and demands funding certainty in order to make purchases and perform long-overdue maintenance.

Every time we pass a continuing resolution and kick the can down the road, that hurts our military. It hurts the very men and women we send into battle each day. It makes their job harder, and, frankly, it puts lives at risk.

We have seen fatal accidents aboard the USS *Fitzgerald* and USS *McCain* caused by insufficient time to train sailors and maintain ships. We have also seen fatal aviation accidents in the Marine Corps as their equipment ages and their training is limited.

The average age of Air Force aircraft is 27 years, and only 5 of 58 Army combat brigades are ''ready to fight tonight.''

Continuing resolutions also hurt our taxpayers. In fact, the Secretary of the Navy recently said that the lack of funding certainty has cost the Navy between $4 billion and $5 billion. It makes it costlier to buy military equipment, and that added cost is ultimately passed on to the taxpayer.

The threats we face today are so great. From China to Russia, to Iran, to North Korea, to terrorist groups around the globe, we haven't seen this serious a threat environment since World War II.

What makes this issue even more frustrating is that both the House and the Senate, in an overwhelmingly bipartisan manner, have passed a defense authorization bill showing our clear support for funding our military at $700 billion. The bill passed with 356 votes in the House and on a unanimous voice vote in the Senate, yet we find ourselves at a deadlock and our government on the verge of a shutdown because congressional Democrats want to advance their immigration agenda.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. I know my colleagues may not like our President; I know my colleagues may not agree with me on immigration; I know my colleagues have different priorities than I do; but for goodness' sake, can we not at least agree that we

should adequately fund our troops and the Nation's military? Can we not at least agree that we shouldn't be playing political games with our military men and women? We can save the political theater for another day.

EXTEND FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CLINICS

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon my colleagues to set up and extend funding for community health clinics.

Community health centers are a vital resource for millions of Americans, providing more coverage at a lower cost. These healthcare providers serve our underserved communities. In rural districts like mine on the central coast of California, they are sometimes the only healthcare provider close enough for patients to receive immediate or long-term care. They provide prenatal care, annual checkups, and lifesaving screenings.

In my district, there are nine federally funded health centers serving approximately 190,000 patients from Santa Cruz to Seaside and from the Salinas Valley to San Benito County. They have dedicated staff that serve the unique and multilingual and multicultural needs of the patients in my district. Without proper funding, these vital community health centers may be forced to reduce their hours of operation, lay off staff, or even close their doors.

We must support our community health centers not just on the central coast of California, but across this Nation. These clinics, their patients, and the people we serve deserve our support. I ask Congress to support our community health clinics.

SUPPORT THE SOS ACT

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, as a father and a grandfather, I know firsthand how important it is that our Nation's children have a safe environment to grow and learn. That is why, this week, I introduced the bipartisan SOS Act.

My bill makes panic buttons available to local school systems. Response time is vitally important during emergency situations. The SOS Act provides a lifesaving technology to contact first responders immediately when an incident takes place in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to building support for this commonsense bill to protect our children in the days and weeks ahead.

VICTORIA MUELLER IS A BRAVE YOUNG LADY

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a brave young lady from my district. She lives in Johnston City, Illinois. Her name is Victoria Mueller. She is class president. She is an A student. She plays in three sports, including football. She is a member of countless school clubs and activities.

Two weeks ago, I called Victoria to let her know that she had received our nomination, as well as DICK DURBIN had called her to let her know about his nomination, for the U.S. Naval Academy.

Unfortunately, her answer was: I am sorry. I can't accept that at this time. You see, in October, I had an accident in a car and my arm was damaged severely and severed.

She has gone through a number of surgeries, but here is what she promised. She will recover from the accident; she will continue to work hard; and she will be receiving that letter and getting that nomination next year.

Her strength, her courage is something that I wanted to make sure that I brought up before this House and before this Nation as truly an inspiration, and it should be an inspiration to all of us.

I am truly inspired by Victoria's strength, her grit, and I wish her the best in her recovery. We will be praying for her.

Victoria, southern Illinois is proud of you, and this Nation is proud of you.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the fact that tomorrow is the March for Life.

As a Member of this body and as a member of the body in the State of Illinois, I have always stood proud to stand up for the rights of the unborn.

We are working on and will vote to eliminate taxpayer-funded abortion through the Hyde amendment and everything as well as that goes, but also cosponsoring the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which is being voted on this week.

This is an issue that quite often brings controversy, Mr. Speaker. Each one of us on this floor—and no matter what our position is, I am sure there are reasons why we hold to those beliefs. Mine are my faith, but they are also experiences that I have had in life, especially when we start talking about the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Fifteen years ago, Mr. Speaker, I was present when my twin granddaughters were born. They were 25½ weeks. We were hoping they would make it to 26. We lost Ellianna in the womb. Losing her caused labor to start, and then Hallie was born. We held Hallie while Hallie passed.

Now, according to some laws that are in this Nation, you should be able to abort a child at that age. Well, I can tell you that you have never held one at that age. We can sit and say: Oh, well, I don't agree with abortion.

But let me tell you something else that has taken place. I think we have a responsibility to take care of those young women who have children who might not be at the best time in their life and issues that come up.

And let me also say this. I want to talk about a group that was formed called Tender Mercies that ministers to women who have lost a child, have aborted a child, had miscarriages, all of these issues. And why do I want to talk about that? Because my daughter runs that not-for-profit to take care of the mental and physical needs that occur after something like that occurs.

It is important that we as members of the United States Congress understand that, when we stand for life, not only do we stand for life, but we also stand for those people who are in those situations, to help them through those times. We are a nation that cares. We are, as many times as we argue back and forth on this floor. Mr. Speaker, I pray that everyone on this floor on both sides of the aisle remembers that.

I thank the people who are walking tomorrow to stand for the right to life.

PASS THE DREAM ACT

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 800,000 DREAMers, including the 200,000 from my home State of California.

Mr. Speaker, these young people are terrified about what will become of them if Congress doesn't live up to its promise to protect them.

There is a way to resolve this. There is a way. Congress can pass the Dream Act, which restores protection for the DREAMers. The act provides for undocumented American students who graduate from American high schools, who are of good moral character, have arrived in the United States as children, and have been in the country continuously for 4 years the opportunity to earn conditional permanent residency for 8 years.

□ 1030

That seems absolutely fair to me, and I think to so many others. Now, during that time, the student must pursue higher education, serve in the military, or work lawfully for at least 3 years.

Students who meet these conditions are granted permanent residency and the ability to one day become U.S. citizens. This is not a handout. This is not a grab by unworthy people. These are very high standards, and I think standards that U.S. citizens should meet day in and day out and don't always meet these standards, most frankly.

This is bipartisan legislation. It is supported by the faith community across our country, by businesses, by law enforcement, and by 82 percent of the American people. I think that that passes a very high standard, a very high test, and I am confident that, if the Speaker of the House would allow a vote on this legislation, it would pass today if it were brought to the floor of the House for a vote.

These 800,000 young men and women are not just court cases or statistics. Each of them has a spark of divinity in them. They are young men and young women who have obtained driver's licenses. They have work permits. They have pursued higher education. They are contributing their talents, their heart and soul, to this country.

Many say: Tell them to go home. They are home. This is the only country they know. This is the country that they love. They are serving in our military. In my congressional district, Silicon Valley, where all Members of Congress want to go and visit and see what innovation is happening, what innovation is bringing about, the majority of those geniuses who are producing this innovation are immigrants to our country.

I stand here as a first-generation American. And if the tenor of some in Congress—not all—but some in Congress—certainly the White House—were in charge when my parents were children, that boat would have had to have made a U-turn. They would not have been welcome in America because they weren't from Norway. They were from the Middle East. Yet, today, their daughter stands here on the floor of the House to address the House and the people of our Nation.

Our Nation, from its beginnings, was built by immigrants. I stand here today to say I love immigrants. They are the backbone of each generation and really the blood that flows through the veins of America. If you put a clamp on that vein, you stop the heart of America from beating.

Shortly after President Trump terminated the DACA program, Pope Francis said: ''To all people''—of the United States—''I ask: take care of the migrant who is a promise of life for the future.''

Please follow his words, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and we will be a better nation because of it.

REBECCA'S STORY OF SLAVERY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Rebecca grew up in a small town in southern Oregon. She was on the honor roll, and she played varsity sports. She graduated high school early and immediately enrolled in Oregon State University. However, when her daughter was born, she had to withdraw to find a job.

Like many single moms, Rebecca struggled to make ends meet. But when she met a man she described as ''Prince Charming,'' she thought things were finally turning around for her. He was kind, and caring, and offered to take care of her and her baby daughter. With expensive gifts and trips, he treated her to a lifestyle that she had never dreamed of. So when he asked her and her daughter to move in with him, Rebecca thought she had hit the jackpot. But her dream quickly became another nightmare.

When she arrived in Las Vegas at his home, she found several other women and children already living there. This man then told her that now she would be forced to have sex with men for money. When she refused, he beat her up, hitting her over and over again.

Fearing for her life and the life of her child, Rebecca complied. So for the next 6 years, Rebecca was forced to have sex with countless strangers many times a day. Any time she stepped out of line, he beat her up. She had her face broken in five different places. Her trafficker even went so far as to tattoo his name on her back. Yes, branded her like cattle. She was nothing but a piece of property to him.

After her fourth attempt to escape, her trafficker told her that he would start selling her young daughter for sex if she didn't comply and submit. Feeling utterly hopeless, Rebecca tried to commit suicide two times. She thought that ending her life was preferable to living in the hell that she had to endure every day.

Finally, Federal agents raided her home and captured the trafficker. But, Mr. Speaker, he eventually took a plea deal and only served 1 year in prison for slavery. Meanwhile, Rebecca was left to deal with a lifetime of pain and trauma. As a former judge, Mr. Speaker, I believe the sentence was too light for a slave trader. No human being should ever have to endure what Rebecca and other trafficking victims like her have gone through.

Despite the system failing to provide justice against her trafficker, Rebecca has found a way to turn her darkness into light. Since becoming a survivor, she started the Rebecca Bender Initiative. This program provides training for those who have the opportunity to be intercepted and intervene with victims who are often being trafficked.

In this Human Trafficking Awareness Month, I want to commend Rebecca on her resilience and focus on providing support and compassion to the victims of trafficking. As co-chair of the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus, along with my friend JIM COSTA from California, we are dedicated to ensuring that victims and survivors know that we as a nation will stand with them.

Traffickers, buyers, and sellers must be prosecuted and sent to the jailhouse. And with the help of local, State, and Federal law enforcement, we are going to stop the sale of our children and our adult women on the marketplace of sex slavery.

Mr. Speaker, the 13th Amendment abolished slavery in the United States, but it is still taking place, and it is time that we defeat this scourge on our community. Justice demands this, and justice is what we do.

And that is just the way it is.

FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IS NEEDED

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about our need to invest in America, to invest in our future. Sound infrastructure is literally and figuratively the foundation of our Nation's economy. But, for quite some time, we in Washington have not provided the critical funding for our infrastructure projects that our communities around the country need.

We must stop living off the investments that our parents and grandparents made generations ago and, instead, start intelligently investing in our infrastructure again. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that, to update our infrastructure system, we need to make an investment of over $1 trillion. And, of course, the President has talked about such a bipartisan package.

One key to intelligent investment is the Federal Government matching infrastructure funds for State and local governments. This is needed, and it has been historic to, in fact, make these projects a reality.

As we see from our history, infrastructure projects in this country move forward most effectively when we have a combination of local, State, and Federal dollars to invest. Across the country, State and local governments are raising funds to repair and improve infrastructure, often making tough political choices for raising taxes or making difficult decisions when required to do so.

This is happening both in red and blue States alike. In all three of the counties in my district, Merced, Madera, and Fresno Counties, they have voted to increase their local sales tax by a half cent in order to pay for essential transportation projects, including road repairs and construction of new road systems and highways.

Last year, the California State Legislature and the Governor enacted a bill to increase the State gas tax and vehicle fees to pay for bridges, roads, and other transportation improvement projects over the next 10 years.

Currently, these are tough decisions, tough political decisions, but the policy implications, notwithstanding the political risks, are worth it. Our State and local leaders in California have taken these risks. It is the right thing to do. It takes dollars to fill potholes. That is the bottom line. To repair bridges and improve road systems, it takes dollars. It is not magic.

And now the Federal Government needs to step up and face the challenge head on. We need to be responsible in our Nation's Capital. I have been working hard for years to improve the infrastructure in California's San Joaquin Valley, both in the statehouse and now here in Congress, and we have made

some progress. But what we are lacking is the Federal component.

It is essential that we build a transportation and water infrastructure system to meet the 21st century system needs, not only of California, but of our entire Nation, and the valley I have the honor and privilege to represent.

We need a more reliable water system to supply our farms and cities that are growing, and with climate change, we know we have to take that into account. We also need a better 21st century system of transportation.

What is missing? I will tell you what is missing: Federal funding; Federal participation. To make this happen, we in Congress should incentivize States and local governments like in California and the counties I represent that have already raised funds for these projects, with a Federal funding stream that will complement these State and local efforts.

California and the San Joaquin Valley are already doing their part, and we need, here in Washington, to do our part to invest in our country's future. This will require Democrats and Republicans to work together to engage in a serious bipartisan deliberation and negotiations this year to make this national infrastructure project a reality.

Last week, we in the Problem Solvers Caucus released a report to the State of our Nation's infrastructure and made bipartisan recommendations on how we get there. These recommendations can serve as a foundation for consensus on which bipartisan collaboration can build the policy that repairs, advances, and invests in America's infrastructure.

Although we have not seen a lot of bipartisan deliberative policymaking here lately, I am urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to show some profiles in courage. We must come together to invest in America's infrastructure if we expect to have the capacity for the economic development and innovation for the future of America in the 21st century.

I have made this a priority throughout my years of service in the San Joaquin Valley, both in Sacramento and now in Washington, D.C. I invite my colleagues to join me in investing in America's infrastructure; work with the President; work on a bipartisan basis.

After all, that is what we are supposed to do in investing in America's infrastructure and, therefore, our future. This has been our tradition in the past and how we have gotten great projects completed, and this is the kind of investment we need to make today for America's infrastructure.

Let us work together. It is the right thing to do.

AFGHANISTAN CONTINUES TO BE A FAILED POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, as we in Congress are faced with another continuing resolution, I cannot help but think about the wasted lives and money in Afghanistan.

On Sunday night's 60 Minutes, I watched, with great interest, a segment about the 16-year war in Afghanistan. The title was: ''Kabul under siege while America's longest war rages on.''

During the interview, Correspondent Lara Logan detailed the growing danger in Afghanistan and interviewed General John Nicholson, commander of American forces in Afghanistan, as well as Afghanistan's President Ghani. While I do not have the time to go into detail, this segment made it very clear—and I think anyone watching would agree—that Afghanistan continues to be a failed policy.

□ 1045

At one time, Lara Logan stated to Nicholson: ''A lot of people at home just don't buy that terrorists are coming from Afghanistan to attack them at home. They are worrying about the guy going to rent a truck from Home Depot and drive into a crowd of civilians.''

In General Nicholson's response, there was a sentence that caught my attention, where he said: ''We need to defeat the ideology.''

I was amazed and astonished by his response. It has been said that you cannot kill an ideology with a bullet or a bomb. So why are we still trying?

This is why I am calling on Speaker RYAN, once again, to permit the House of Representatives to have a policy debate on Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I have beside me a poster of a young woman whose husband was killed in Afghanistan. It is so pathetic because the woman and the mother of the little girl sitting in her lap is crying, yet the little girl is looking at the Army officer with a look like: Why am I here? Why is there a flag-draped coffin? Why is my mother crying?

The little girl is too young to really understand what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Speaker RYAN to let us have a debate on the policy issue of Afghanistan and its future.

I will close with the words of the 31st Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Chuck Krulak, who said: ''No one has ever conquered Afghanistan, and many have tried. We will join the list of nations that tried and failed.''

Mr. RYAN, the Speaker of the House, it is your time to call for this House to debate the future of Afghanistan. Please make that call to the House of Representatives that we will have that debate.

OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS DRILLING

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the Trump administration's proposal to lift a decades-old ban on offshore oil and gas drilling on our country's Atlantic and Pacific Coasts.

This proposal has to be one of the most irresponsible actions of the Trump administration. Currently, 94 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf is off limits to drilling, and rightly so, given the importance of protecting the economic and cultural value of the country's coastlines.

The Trump administration has offered a staggering reversal, proposing to open up over 90 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf to oil and gas drilling. While Governors and lawmakers from both parties have risen to voice their opposition to this plan, this administration is moving forward at a breakneck speed. It has given a mere 60 days for the public to comment. In my home State of Maine, which has much to lose from this plan, we don't even get a full public hearing.

This proposal's lack of transparency and fairness couldn't have been more apparent than when Governor Rick Scott of Florida somehow earned an exemption for his State. Everyone can see that this was less about protecting Florida's pristine beaches and coastline, as Governor Scott said, than a political favor from President Trump.

Mr. Speaker, I absolutely have nothing against the Florida coast. But the State shouldn't have to be home to Mar-a-Lago to earn an exemption from this awful plan. All coastal States deserve this protection.

My home State of Maine is one of them. If you measured every inch of our State's jagged coastline and islands, it would measure an incredible 3,500 miles. Those miles include some of the most beautiful places in the world and critical habitat for hundreds of species of fish and wildlife.

That coast is also dotted with dozens of small towns filled with hardworking people who depend on a beautiful, healthy ocean to make their living.

Two of my State's largest industries are tourism and fishing. Tourism in Maine is a $5.6 billion industry, 71 percent of which comes directly in from the Maine coast. Millions of people visit our State to experience our beautiful coastline, snug harbors, and stunning landmarks, like the Marshall Point Lighthouse in Port Clyde.

Our fishing industry and businesses that support it have even more to lose from this proposal. Thirty thousand Mainers make their living in marine industries. They include boat builders, ground fishermen, clammers, seaweed harvesters, oyster and mussel farmers, and, of course, lobstermen.

Our world-famous lobster fishing industry alone brings in $500 million annually. I have had so many discussions with the lobster fishermen who tell me about all the difficulties their industry already faces. They want to pass their businesses on to their sons and daughters, but they worry about the future.

Will the Gulf of Maine, which is already warming faster than 99.9 percent

of the world's ocean waters, remain prime habitat for lobster? Will ocean acidification harm the lobster population and shellfish in ways we don't already know about yet?

Do we really need to add the potential of an oil spill to the list of things that already keep them up at night?

In Maine, we know the risk because we have seen the consequences. In 1996, a tanker named the *Julie N.* spilled about 200,000 gallons of heating oil in Maine's Casco Bay. It cost over $40 million to clean up and it caused lobster prices to plummet.

About 200,000 gallons of spilled oil is a drop in the bucket when you talk about the spilled oil from the Deepwater Horizon, which spilled 200 million gallons into the Gulf of Mexico. The result on the marine environment was devastating. Shrimp, crab, oyster, and other fisheries in those States may never fully recover.

The risks of this proposal to my State and others are simply too great. And for what? Our Nation is already the top producer of oil and gas in the world, and with fuel prices currently low, this proposal would not boost the economy.

If this administration is really worried about remaining internationally competitive in the energy market, it should throw its support behind developing alternative energy sources instead of abandoning them.

This proposal is unacceptable and irresponsible. I will continue to fight back against the environmental and economic harm it threatens for Maine and the Nation. I am proud to cosponsor legislation with my colleagues in New England to prohibit drilling off our States, and another bill to keep the drilling ban in place entirely along the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts. I encourage all my colleagues to do the same and to stop this terrible plan before it is too late.

HOPE FOR TERMINALLY ILL PATIENTS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, roughly 4 years ago, Steve Mayfield was a respected high school football coach at Central High School in Lauderdale County, Alabama, who, in October 2014, was diagnosed with ALS.

Steve Mayfield bravely fought his terminal disease and kept a smile on his face throughout his lengthy 3-year battle and ordeal.

In a land of freedom and liberty, Steve Mayfield would have had two choices. On the one hand, he could abide by Food and Drug Administration regulations and recommendations and die; or on the other hand, Steve Mayfield could try experimental treatments that gave some hope of beating ALS and extending Steve Mayfield's life.

Unfortunately, when it comes to terminal illnesses in America, there is no freedom or liberty. Steve Mayfield not only had to fight ALS, he also had to fight the Food and Drug Administration before he could try experimental but potentially lifesaving treatments.

Sadly, Steve Mayfield lost both fights. Steve Mayfield was barred by the Federal Government from trying possibly lifesaving treatments and, not long ago, passed away. Steve Mayfield's son, Brooks Mayfield, from Florence, Alabama, was with his father when he passed away.

It is in that vein, Mr. Speaker, that I call on the House to have a floor vote on Senate bill S. 204, the Right to Try Act, which passed the Senate last year, that restores the right of terminally ill patients to try experimental treatments that may save their lives. Brooks Mayfield's father might be alive today if the Right to Try Act had been the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember who we are as Americans. Our ancestors fought the Revolutionary War over liberty and freedom, yet, today in America, patients who are 100 percent certain to die are denied the freedom, the liberty, the right to decide for themselves whether to try experimental treatments that may save their lives. Every day in America, terminally ill patients and their families are told there are no options but death.

By way of background, fewer than 3 percent of terminally ill patients in America have access to investigational treatments through clinical trials. While the Food and Drug Administration grants compassionate use waivers meant to allow terminal patients access to experimental drugs, only about 1,500 waivers were granted in 2016.

What are other terminally ill Americans to do? Nothing? Just waste away and die without a fight?

Patients shouldn't have to give up their liberty, their freedom, their fight against terminal illness merely because the Food and Drug Administration says so. Terminally ill patients shouldn't have to beg the FDA for a waiver, forcing patients to fight the Federal bureaucracy, when they are already fighting for their lives.

The Right to Try Act gives terminally ill patients access to treatments that have successfully completed the FDA's phase one approval requirement but not yet completed the FDA's lengthy and complex full approval process that can take decades.

Sadly, sometimes when treatments and drugs reach final approval, it is too late for too many patients and their families because the terminally ill patient has already died.

Mr. Speaker, given the stark contrasts between life and death, between freedom and Federal dictates, between hope and hopelessness, the House should take up and pass the Right to Try Act, thereby giving a chance for life to terminally ill patients and their families.

The United States Senate overwhelmingly passed Right to Try legislation last year. It is time for the House to do the same, thereby restoring freedom, liberty, and hope, and giving terminally ill patients across America a better chance to live.

DACA

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, DACA must be fixed for the good of these young immigrants and for the good of our Nation.

In September, Leaders Pelosi and Schumer and President Trump agreed to protect DACA recipients and improve border security. Since that time, I have worked in the 48–Member, bipartisan House Problem Solvers Caucus to come up with a plan that would do just that.

I thank Senators DURBIN, GRAHAM, BENNET, GARDNER, MENENDEZ, and FLAKE, who have put together a compromise bill in the Senate, which is gaining momentum. After working on this for 5 months, I know just how hard it is to come up with a compromise, so I just want to thank these Senators for what they have done.

The Problem Solvers Caucus continues to work on a plan, and I am hopeful that we will have one imminently because time is running short.

I was very happy to hear Congressman GUTIÉRREZ right here from this podium a few minutes ago endorse the idea of a compromise even though it is not what he wants, but we need to protect these DACA recipients.

We have to break the status quo in Washington—the bickering and the gridlock—which gets in the way of good solutions for our country. This solution on DACA can and should get done if only we can get away from the rhetoric and use some common sense.

□ 1100

Unfortunately, common sense is not common in Washington. I call on my colleagues to get past the bickering and the rhetoric. Do what is right for the American people. Fix DACA, and let's move on and do great things together for our Nation.

RECOGNIZING DR. TIMOTHY M. BLOCK

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my constituent Dr. Timothy M. Block, president of the Hepatitis B Foundation, Baruch S. Blumberg Institute of Living Science, and the Pennsylvania Biotechnology Center in my district in Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Block was recently named as a fellow of the U.S. National Academy of Inventors. Being elected as a NAI fellow is the highest professional recognition for academic inventors who have

shown a lifelong commitment to innovation, specifically by facilitating or creating inventions that make a measurable impact on quality of life, economic development, or the welfare of society.

Dr. Block is being recognized for his contributions to therapeutic drug and biomarker of disease screening and discovery. He also holds numerous patents and has been involved in more than 30 years in viral hepatitis research.

Mr. Speaker, we thank Dr. Block for the work that he has done in this field, which has undoubtedly impacted the people in my district, throughout our country, and around the world.

RECOGNIZING ARCHBISHOP WOOD FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the players, staff, and coaches of the Archbishop Wood football team and congratulate them on winning the PIAA Class 5A State championship. With their discipline and hard work, the young men of this football team have continued a tradition of excellence for the Vikings. The dominance they displayed in their championship win in December is an excellent example of what teamwork and tenacity can achieve. They have made our community very proud.

To the coaching staff, we say congratulations and thank you for leading and teaching these young men. It is my hope that the lessons of determination and perseverance that these student athletes have learned will help guide them off the field as well.

To the fans, friends, and family that have supported Archbishop Wood, we say congratulations. To all those who work with and support organized youth sports in our district, we say thank you.

SUPPORT FOR THE 2018 XXIII OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES BEING HOSTED IN SOUTH KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 2018 XXIII Olympic Winter Games being hosted in Pyeongchang, South Korea, next month. I am proud of the many Korean Americans in the Ninth Congressional District who make the USA a better place to live.

The Olympic Games serve as a forum for the international community to come together to build a peaceful world. In order to be a competitor in the Olympic Games, nations across the globe have to embody the values and ideals of friendship, solidarity, and fair play. It is no different in the diplomatic arena.

Without these core values, the spirit of fair competition is eroded. The common bond that brings nations from all over the world to compete and build friendships serves as a forum to promote tolerance and understanding. Promoting these ideals is critical to these increasingly troubled times, and I believe the results can make our world a more peaceful place.

The upcoming Winter Olympic Games presents a significant opportunity for the United States of America to lead the fight against international conflicts and to promote peace. This is our legacy.

Our Nation can use this opportunity to work with the international community in a way that shows that we can come together in the spirit of healthy competition, regardless of our differences.

With the long shadow being cast by the provocations of Pyongyang and rhetoric from our own administration, the Olympic Winter Games came at the right time. They are an opportunity for the United States to speak out in support of resolving the current conflicts on the Korean Peninsula.

While there are many issues facing the international community, all can agree the growing threat of nuclear conflict presents the most immediate danger. In order to deescalate the growing threat, and in the spirit of the Olympic Games themselves, I hope that our athletes' presence in South Korea will serve as a symbolic representation that our differences can be worked out on a neutral field.

Further, it is reassuring that North Korea will participate in the upcoming Winter Olympics. If the reports are true, it will be encouraging to watch the two countries' athletes march together at the opening ceremony under a unification flag. That surpasses the consequences of empty rhetorical threats. We can do better than that.

It took the Winter Olympics to thaw the ice between the two nations, who have not met in 2 years. This is a welcome sign of easing tensions after months of alarm over North Korea's nuclear program.

As a result, this year's Olympic Games are already off to a great start. The Games will continue to be a reminder that, regardless of where someone is from, we can still set our differences aside for a better world, just like the first athletes who came together to start the Olympic tradition.

It is my expectation that the Republic of Korea will host a successful 2018 XXIII Olympic Winter Games and that the hard work and dedication of the Korean people to this endeavor will be remembered by the international community.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to watching the men and women representing the United States of America bring home the gold.

RECOGNIZING YOUTH ENTREPRENEURS

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the nonprofit Youth Entrepreneurs for their commitment to preparing our students to meet the demands of today's workforce. This program provides a taste of the workforce in a variety of career paths for our emerging leaders.

Youth Entrepreneurs was started in 1991, in Wichita, Kansas, with the goal to give young adults a foundation of knowledge, skills, and values for today's workplace. High school students who participate in the Youth Entrepreneurship Program receive a preparation course that covers the ins-and-outs of a variety of career fields and business etiquette.

After students complete the class, they are sent to work at a business that matches their interest. The students are able to apply their learning from the classroom at the company they are paired with.

For 26 years, this nonprofit has been dedicated to education and the success of our youth. Today, I want to make sure they know that their hard work has not gone unnoticed. Personally, I have seen and heard the success stories from these young adults, including my own godson, Patrick, who has participated in this organization.

The program has expanded to 10 other States and graduated thousands of students. More than 80 percent of the participants say they want to attend college, and 60 percent of the students who have completed the requirements have either started their own business or desire to one day.

I am proud of programs like Youth Entrepreneurs that are working to give our young adults a pathway for success. Even with unemployment at an all-time record low in Kansas, there are still 50,000 open jobs in our State. It is important that our students have access to organizations like Youth Entrepreneurs so that we can prepare Kansans to meet these high employment demands.

KANSAS MEETING STEM DEMANDS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an industry that presents endless opportunities for America's workforce. As our Nation continues to advance technologically, it is imperative that our youth have the skills necessary to remain competitive in the workforce.

Kansas is experiencing record employment across the State; however, one industry faces an increasingly high demand for skilled workers. Today, Kansas has more than 2,500 open computer science jobs, which is two times higher than the average State's demand. This year alone, the United States Department of Labor predicts employers will be unable to fill nearly 2.5 million job openings in STEM-related—or Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math—professions.

Last week, I met with the students from the North Central Kansas Technical College. NCKTC is ranked third in the Nation in job placement in tech-related fields. I am so proud to see colleges throughout my district working

hard to meet the challenges that our labor force is facing today by offering more STEM-based curricula.

Northwest Kansas Technical College offers programs and certification courses in computer science and coding, while Hutchinson Community College's Business and Industry Institute, also in my district, incorporates computer and science technology into their training programs.

Emporia State University recognizes our future by offering STEM-concentration classes for kindergarten through sixth-grade teachers. This program for teachers ensures that our youth will get a greater understanding of these technical skills at a younger age and ultimately be better equipped for future jobs in the STEM industry.

It is important that we recognize these colleges' efforts and their computer science initiatives that will prepare students for success in these growing career fields.

As a Member of Congress, I always strive to create opportunities for my constituents back home, but we must also take advantage of the opportunities at our doorstep. It is imperative that we continue to place a focus on STEM education. As computer science becomes a skill utilized in almost every industry, we must ensure our children are well prepared to meet these demands.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT FIRST CLASS ALWYN CASHE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, I am filing legislation to honor an American hero. My bill would name the U.S. Post Office at 567 East Franklin Street in Oviedo, Florida, in honor of one of its native sons, Sergeant First Class Alwyn Cashe.

Scripture teaches us that there is no greater love than to lay down your life for your friends. On October 17, 2005, in an Iraqi province north of Baghdad, Sergeant First Class Cashe made the ultimate expression of love, disregarding his personal safety and enduring unimaginable pain in order to save multiple soldiers under his command from their burning vehicle after it hit an improvised explosive device.

His actions that fateful day were so remarkable that they almost defy description. Words like ''courage'' and ''bravery'' do not seem adequate to fully capture the deeds this soldier performed.

The actions that Sergeant First Class Cashe took resulted in his death, as he must have known they would. After his passing, Sergeant First Class Cashe received the Silver Star, the third-highest combat award that the Army confers.

Over the past years, there has been a passionate, painstaking, and patient effort to have Sergeant First Class Cashe's Silver Star upgraded to the Medal of Honor. Notably, this effort has been led by the battalion commander who nominated him for the Silver Star. This individual, now a two-star general, came to believe he deserves the award. I strongly agree with this conclusion.

But right now, I want to talk not about medals but about the man himself, because that is what matters the most.

Alwyn was born in 1970 in Sanford, Florida, and was raised in Oviedo, attending Oviedo High School. He was the youngest of nine children—five girls and four boys. The family didn't have much money, but they had plenty of pride. When Alwyn was just 6, his father passed away. Alwyn's mother, Ruby Mae, worked long hours at demanding jobs, working on an assembly line and, later, as a custodian at Florida Tech, since renamed the University of Central Florida.

One of Alwyn's sisters, Kasinal, who is now an ICU nurse, describes her brother as the baby of the family, rambunctious, a little spoiled by his siblings, and, of course, deeply loved. She remembers buying him a 10-speed bike so he wouldn't be different from the other kids in the neighborhood and how happy he was.

Alwyn enlisted in the military after high school. Kasinal told us it had a transformational effect, turning this aimless boy into a resolute man, the civilian into a soldier—and not just any soldier, but a soldier's soldier, a tough-as-nails infantryman, and an old-school leader in the best sense of the term.

As Kasinal put it, Alwyn bled Army green right from the start. The Army gave him a second family with even more brothers and sisters, bound together by the American flag on their uniform and the events they experienced and endured together, from boot camp to combat.

On October 17, 2005, Alwyn, now Sergeant First Class Cashe, was on his second deployment to Iraq. The Bradley Fighting Vehicle carrying him, six other American soldiers, and the squad's interpreter struck an IED. The blast instantly killed the interpreter and ruptured the vehicle's fuel cell.

□ 1115

Flames engulfed the vehicle. Initially, only lightly injured, but covered in fuel, he descended into the hull, extracted the driver, who was on fire, and extinguished the flames. At this point, multiple soldiers remained in the vehicle, one of whom managed to open the rear hatch.

Sergeant First Class Cashe rushed to the back of the vehicle, reached into the hot flames, and started pulling out soldiers. His fuel-soaked uniform caught fire and the flames spread quickly over his body. Despite what must have been terrible pain, he returned to the vehicle twice more to extract his soldiers, all while he was still on fire and exposed to enemy gunfire.

By the time all the soldiers were saved from the vehicle, his injuries were the most severe. Second- and third-degree burns covered 72 percent of his body. Nevertheless, he refused to be evacuated until all his soldiers were medevacked out before him.

When he arrived at the U.S. military hospital at Balad Air Base in Iraq, he was still fully conscious. What remained of his uniform had melted to his skin, yet he tried to fight off the nurses, insisting that they treat everyone else first. Despite determined efforts to save his life at various hospitals abroad and in the States, he eventually succumbed to his wounds on November 8, 2005, surrounded by members of his biological family and his Army family.

Sergeant First Class Cashe's actions reflect the highest standards of servant leadership, devotion to duty, and sheer bravery.

We cannot bring Sergeant First Class Cashe back or erase the pain felt by those who loved him and those who served alongside him, but we can pay tribute to his life and his legacy. We can engrave his name on a plaque and designate a Federal building in his memory so the public never forgets this American soldier, this son of Oviedo, who laid down his life for his friends in service to our country.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TAYLOR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, January is National Mentoring Month. Never underestimate the big impact that you can make with a little contribution of your time, wisdom, and attention.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the Big Brothers Big Sisters of America organization. The Big Brothers Big Sisters of America movement began in 1904. Big Brothers Big Sisters of America currently operates throughout the U.S. and in 12 countries across the world.

Children joining Big Brothers Big Sisters of America are carefully placed in a one-on-one relationship with an older volunteer in a key stage in their development. These children are less likely to engage in such behaviors, such as drug use, other illegal activities, or social dysfunction.

One such big brother, Andrew Jones, signed up for the program. Years ago, he met a young 12-year-old. This boy was from a low-income, single-parent household. His mother worked a lot of overtime at a local hospital. Misguided, the boy was already on probation at 12 years old, hanging around the wrong crowd, and headed in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, Andrew would take the boy to the English Grill restaurant for a weekly $2.22 breakfast: two eggs, two

pancakes, and two sausages. He would teach the boy everything from having a napkin on his lap at the dinner table to stock options.

For years to come, Andrew would attend hundreds of sporting events for the boy, show him the value of reading, reinforce manners, and build his self-confidence.

Andrew would be the only person the boy would talk to if he lost a wrestling match. He would be the first person the boy would call for advice. Mr. Speaker, he would be the first person the boy would call from a tent hospital after being injured as a soldier in the deserts of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, that little boy is me.

We can all seek out mentors in our own lives and we can all be mentors for others. We are all in this together. Never underestimate the big impact that you can make with a little contribution of your time, wisdom, and attention.

AMERICA IS JUDGED BY THEIR ACTIONS

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I have the superlative pleasure of speaking from the well of the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a liberated Democrat.

I rise today to speak truth to power.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to remind us that, although we are the leaders of the free world, we will not be received as the leaders of the free world if we are perceived as the leader of worldwide bigotry.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to remind us that we won't be received as the leaders of the free world if we are perceived as being anti-immigration when it comes to Muslims and, as a result, xenophobic.

We won't be received as leaders of the free world if we are perceived as homophobic because we are anti-transgender.

We won't be received as leaders of the free world if we are perceived as anti-Africa because it is a continent of s---hole countries. We will be perceived, quite frankly, and received as racist if we do so.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to maintain our preeminence in the world, we must not be perceived as the bigots of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the solution can be an election in 2020, or it can be impeachment tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I will bring impeachment before the Congress of the United States of America again tomorrow sometime after 9 a.m. and before we leave for our break.

Mr. Speaker, history is watching. We will be judged by our actions. Time will tell. I will be on the right side of history.

CELEBRATING 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF SCOTT'S DOWNTOWN

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Scott's Downtown in Gainesville, Georgia. Recently, the restaurant celebrated its 10th anniversary, and, to mark this achievement, the staff chose to honor local law enforcement with a luncheon.

When Scott Dixon first opened Scott's Downtown in 2007, he took the first step in pursuing his long-held dream.

Scott began bussing tables at the age of 13 and worked his way up the ladder in the restaurant industry. Over the course of his career, he has developed a passion for brightening people's days with food and a friendly heart.

A decade in, Scott's Downtown is a Gainesville favorite, known for providing residents with exceptional food. Rather than highlight this success, however, Scott's Downtown points to the courage and service of our law enforcement officials who put their lives on the line each day to protect our community.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Scott's Downtown on their first 10 years of service, and I join them in thanking the brave men and women in blue who make Gainesville a safe and beautiful place to live.

CELEBRATING Z. BROWN DISTILLERY'S 500TH BARREL OF BOURBON

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the staff at Z. Brown Distillery in Dahlonega, Georgia, in celebrating their 500th barrel of northeast Georgia bourbon.

The partnership of master distiller Jeff Odem; his wife, Diane Kelly; and Dahlonega native and Grammy award-winning musician Zac Brown is great news for Lumpkin County. They are turning local crops into high-quality, small-batch spirits. In the span of a few weeks, business has already taken off with the construction of two new buildings for expansion.

My friends and neighbors in northeast Georgia can agree that it's the little things in life that mean the most. This distillery captures the warm, inviting nature of the Georgia mountains in its product.

The distillery welcomes visitors from near and far, and leaves them with a greater appreciation for the tastes of Appalachia. I congratulate Z. Brown Distillery on its success, and I wish its team the best as their young business branches out in northeast Georgia.

JOINING HANDS IN THE MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 45th annual March for Life, which takes place this Friday.

Across our country, Americans will help defend innocent lives by giving them a clear voice in Washington. We are a nation of people who strive to fight for individual freedoms, yet we deprive the unborn of their most fundamental liberty: the right to a birthday.

As a father of three, a pastor, and an Air Force chaplain, I believe we have a sacred responsibility to protect the lives of the unborn. Every life has value and every child deserves a birthday.

This week, the House will vote to increase protections for unborn Americans through the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This legislation would ensure that a child born after a failed abortion attempt receives the same life-giving medical care that any newborn would receive. The bill would also prohibit medical providers from continuing the abortion procedure postbirth.

No one should be able to end another person's life, no matter how small, for convenience. Northeast Georgians value life, and I am thankful to join them in the fight against abortion and to promote bright futures for all Americans—the born and unborn—among us.

To the father, it is mentioned many times, that you care for your children. On these days and this week, I harken back almost 26 years ago to when my daughter, Jordan, was born. Jordan was born with spina bifida. When many said to my wife and me that we had choices to end, I am happy to say that almost every day I wake up to a text from my daughter that says: ''Good morning, Daddy. I'm headed to work.''

All life is precious. All life deserves a chance. Every day I am blessed with the knowledge that the choice we made, and the choice that we would have always made, was for our precious daughter, Jordan, and for all of those who are seeking a birthday.

RECOGNIZING ANDREA JUNG AND GRAMEEN BANK

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Grameen America for opening a new facility in Miami, and to recognize its president and CEO, Andrea Jung.

Grameen America is a nonprofit microfinance organization that, for over 10 years, has been dedicated to helping women in poverty create and expand small businesses in their communities.

Last month, Grameen opened its first branch in Miami, where it hopes to serve 7,000 women over the next 5 years and disburse more than $21.5 million in loans. What a difference that will make.

Mr. Speaker, today, sadly, more than 20 percent of women in my county—Miami-Dade County—are living in poverty. These loans will empower them to become active players in strengthening south Florida's economy.

This organization is spearheaded by Andrea Jung, who, from a young age, understood the important value of empowering women to become financially independent.

As a Chinese immigrant in Toronto, Andrea's grandmother received a loan that changed her family's history, as the loan helped Jung's grandmother to open her own hair salon.

Two generations later, after attending Princeton, Andrea served over a decade as CEO and chairman of Avon Products, a giant in the field of beauty products.

Andrea has been ranked among the top leaders on lists such as Fortune magazine's ''Most Powerful Women in Business'' and ''Most Powerful Women in the World,'' and the Financial Times' ''Top Women in World Business.''

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of the work of Andrea and Grameen America in what they are doing. They are giving women in need the ability to improve the lives of their own and their families.

The opening of this new branch is an exciting opportunity. I look forward to working with Andrea to help women in our south Florida community.

SUPPORTING THE 8TH ANNUAL DAN MARINO FOUNDATION WALKABOUT AUTISM

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage my south Florida community to take part in the 8th annual Dan Marino Foundation WalkAbout Autism. This event will take place on Saturday, January 27, at the Hard Rock Stadium in Miami Gardens.

According to the CDC, over 3 million individuals in the United States are impacted by an autism spectrum disorder. There have been numerous dramatic scientific advances in our understanding of autism, but we must continue making progress toward effective treatments and eventually, yes, a cure.

The WalkAbout Autism will bring together families, parents, caregivers, and friends to raise awareness and resources for the south Florida autism community. More importantly, every donation made will stay in our local community and will be used to provide classroom equipment, employment services, new adaptive technologies, and more to those impacted by this disorder.

This walk also helps fund essential educational opportunities, like special needs programming at local schools and the Marino Campus, whose postsecondary education program helps young adults with autism bridge the gap between high school and employment.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Dan Marino Foundation for all of its hard work to make this walk so successful, and this year will be no different.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to participate in this walk for a great cause at the Hard Rock Stadium on Saturday, January 27, at 8 a.m.

□ 1130

CELEBRATING CITY YEAR MIAMI

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight the 2018 Miami Creator's Ball that will take place at LMNCTY on Friday, January 26 to celebrate the 10th anniversary of City Year Miami.

City Year volunteers, in their distinctive red jackets, have become a fixture at most of our Miami schools. This wonderful organization connects mentors with students in underserved schools who are at risk of dropping out.

City Year Miami members have served more than 225,000 students and have given more than 2 million hours of service to our local schools, and the results speak for themselves. City Year has not only helped more of Miami's at-risk students graduate on time, but it has played a key role in ensuring that more than 80 percent of Miami-Dade students earn their high school diplomas—Simply amazing. Furthermore, 90 percent of Miami teachers say that City Year members help their students improve their overall academic performance.

As a former Florida certified teacher, it fills me with great pride to encourage everyone in our community to come to LMNCTY in Miami-Dade County on Friday, January 26 to celebrate City Year Miami's 10th anniversary.

LIVING IN DR. KING'S FOOTSTEPS

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during the week of Martin Luther King Jr. Day to recognize three of my constituents who are living in Dr. King's footsteps.

Dr. King once said: ''Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that.''

In the Third District of Kansas, as well as across the country, we continue to see darkness and hate. Just last year, an Olathe resident shot two immigrants from India in a local restaurant, telling them to get out of his country. One of them, Srinivas Kuchibhotla, was killed.

In 2014, a white supremacist from Missouri drove to the Jewish Community Center in Overland Park and murdered three people as part of a mission to kill Jewish residents in our community. Three people were killed: Reat Underwood, William Corporon, and Terry LaManno.

In both of these cases, we saw the very worst of humanity, the very racism and bigotry and evil that Dr. King led our Nation so fiercely against. In each of these cases, we also see the beauty of humanity's power of kindness, endurance, forgiveness, and love.

Sunayana Dumala, whose husband was killed in that tragedy in Olathe, Kansas, has turned this tragedy into an opportunity to spread a message of love and acceptance. The heartbreaking loss of her husband, along with visa problems due to our broken immigration system, has made this a very difficult last year for Sunayana. She questioned, understandably, whether she and other Indian immigrants were welcome here. However, our community rallied around her with the unmistakable answer that, yes, you are loved, you are part of our community, and you are welcome here.

Now Sunayana has become a leading voice against hatred. She is leading others in this effort to embrace diversity in race, culture, and religion. She is planning a peace walk later this year and has launched an initiative called Forever Welcome that promotes understanding and acceptance of immigrants. She is a living example of love standing up in the face of hatred.

Another story is Mindy Corporon, who lost both her father and son in the attack at the Jewish community center in 2014. She did not let the loss of her family members turn her to hatred. Instead, she set out to bring light into the darkness left by this event. She launched SevenDays: Make a Ripple, Change the World, a weeklong event commemorating the tragedy which seeks to turn one ripple of kindness into an unstoppable wave of faith and love. SevenDays challenges all of us to embrace diversity, to foster hope, and to promote love. Her tireless efforts fall right in the footsteps of Dr. King.

Just recently, I was moved by the story of Sonia Warshawski, who is being featured in a documentary, titled, ''Big Sonia.'' As one of the last Holocaust survivors in my district, she is telling the story of the unspeakable tragedy she endured as a teenager at a concentration camp, being split from her father and brother, and literally watching her mother being marched to her death in the gas chambers. Yet here she is, preaching tolerance, kindness, and, most of all, love for one another.

Mindy, Sunayana, and Sonia are just three members of our community who are living out Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s legacy in their everyday lives. In each of their stories, extreme racism, bigotry was spread through its known weapons—fear and violence—and in each case, these women responded with courage, love, and kindness, just as Dr. King preached.

These three women in my district are leading the way in the daily, ongoing fight for justice, tolerance, and love. They are an example for all of us to follow as we work to make our community a better place.

Mr. Speaker, let us continue to teach love. Let us continue to be the light that drives out the darkness. Let us move forward as a nation and as a people together, united, and we will one day achieve Dr. King's dream.

FRUITS OF TAX REFORM

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, last month we concluded an intense debate over tax reform, and I want, again, to

thank Chairman BRADY for heeding the concerns of those of us from overtaxed States like California.

By allowing greater flexibility in deducting State and local taxes and by lowering all tax rates, the final measure assures that virtually every family will be paying lower taxes even though losing much of their State and local tax deductions. In fact, in my district, the average household will see a tax cut of $1,900 as a result.

Yet I still receive many calls from constituents who fear their taxes will go up and their standard of living will go down. They believe this because this is what they have been told by the Democrats and by the media.

Now that the bill is in effect, I think people are about to see their paychecks grow, their job prospects brighten, and their family finances improve. Indeed, the day that President Trump signed the bill, companies across America began announcing bonuses, pay raises, and major new investment plans in the American economy, and those announcements just keep coming.

A variety of tax calculators are already available on the internet so that every family can see for themselves how they personally benefit from the tax cuts. I would recommend a Web site called taxplancalculator.com. There, people can input their own tax figures and see how much their family will save.

In February, withholding tables will reflect the newer, lower rates, and the take-home pay for the vast majority of Americans will jump even before accounting for the surge in wages that always accompanies an economic expansion.

By spring, most economists expect a significant burst of economic growth. As tax barriers come down, capital stranded offshore is already coming home. This morning, Apple announced it is bringing back most of its quarter trillion dollars of capital now stuck offshore.

Immediate expensing reforms will accelerate equipment purchases, and an internationally competitive corporate tax rate will mean new investments in making products, once again, in America.

If The New York Times poll from yesterday is any indication, the American people are already beginning to see the truth. That poll tracked an 18-point swing from disapproval to approval of the reform in just 1 month.

The scare-mongering by congressional Democrats went further than claims that the tax reform would produce only middle class misery and economic malaise. They also claimed that millions of Americans would lose their health insurance because of it. How so? Because this bill removes the stiff tax penalties that are levied against 6½ million American families who choose not to purchase overpriced ObamaCare policies. It is a minimum of $2,100 of penalty for a family of four. These families will now have that money available to meet their own needs, including purchasing inexpensive policies available on the private market.

This begs two questions: If ObamaCare is so wonderful, why do we have to force families to buy it? And, if 6½ million families already prefer paying the stiff penalty to buying the insurance, what does that say about the signature achievement of the Obama Democrats?

The Democrats have seized on projections that the reform will add $1.5 trillion of new debt over the next 10 years based on their assumption it will produce no economic growth. Yet, when Ronald Reagan cut the top marginal tax rate by half, income tax revenues doubled. Several prominent economists are predicting an additional $2 trillion of new tax revenues to all levels of government solely due to economic expansion from this law.

The final line of attack is that the personal income tax cuts will expire in 8 years, leaving many Americans worse off. Well, that is perhaps the most dangerous argument for the Democrats to make because every American understands the answer to that question depends upon who controls Congress.

Democrats have made it clear that, if they are returned to office, the tax cuts are over, and Republicans have made it just as clear that our unfinished business is make take those cuts permanent. Let the people decide.

Ronald Reagan asked a simple question both in 1980 when he ran against the economic malaise of the Carter policies and again in 1984 after he had implemented the same progrowth policies we now see under President Trump: Are you better off today than you were 4 years ago?

No politician or pundit can spin the answer to that question. Every individual American knows that answer precisely in their own lives. And I am looking forward to asking that question again as the tax reform takes effect.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (11 o'clock and 40 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:

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

With the Psalmist, we pray: O, Lord, open my lips, and my mouth will declare Your praise.

Even before the first word is formulated, Lord, guide our minds, our thoughts, our hearts and desires. By Your holy spirit, breathe into us a new spirit. Shape this Congress and our world according to Your design that we may fulfill Your holy will.

Give the Members of this people's House the gift of attentive hearts and open minds, that through the diversity of ideas they may sort out what is best for this Nation. Let them not be afraid of silence, that even before they speak, they may heed Your revealed Word with longing.

May their speech be deliberately free of all prejudice that others may listen wholeheartedly, then their dialogue will be mutually respectful in the hope of bringing unity and justice.

May all that we do be done 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. WILSON of South Carolina. 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. WILSON of South Carolina. 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 Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida 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.

MARCHING FOR WHAT IS RIGHT

(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, I am grateful in unity with the thousands of dedicated citizens traveling to Washington this week for the 45th annual March for Life. The vision is of a world where every life is valued and protected. It is one I support every day in Congress.

Earlier this month, I had the opportunity to meet with Ryan Bomberger in Columbia. Although Ryan's biological mother was raped, she chose life for Ryan and gave him an opportunity to grow up in a loving, adopted family. His witness and success demonstrate the importance of ensuring that the unborn have an opportunity for a fulfilling life.

I also appreciate the commitment and enthusiasm of the South Carolina Citizens for Life executive director, Holly Gatling. Through her hard work and the efforts from the South Carolina Citizens for Life team, hundreds of people, including myself, gathered at the statehouse steps this month for the Stand Up for Life Rally with Bishop Robert Guglielmone of Charleston and Attorney General Alan Wilson.

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

Congratulations to Republicans Nancy Mace of Charleston and Ashley Trantham of Greenville for their elections to the South Carolina House of Representatives.

A TERRIBLE INDICTMENT ON CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, a continuing resolution to extend Federal spending for 1 month may not pass because the President tweeted that he does not support funding for healthcare for 9 million American kids.

This is a terrible indictment on a congressional leadership that is again cowering to a petulant, uninformed, and impulsive President, a President who is making a mockery of Congress as a coequal branch of the Federal Government; and that the congressional Republican leadership is complicit is a national embarrassment. I say Congress should roll the President and force him to veto children's healthcare.

Mr. President, a continuing resolution is a failure to act; it is a failure to decide; it is a failure to lead; and it represents gross negligence as it relates to the basic duty of the institution of the United States Congress.

This is a sad day. Once again, Congress capitulates to a petulant and pouting President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

DISCUSSING H.R. 4770, PROTECTING AND SECURING FLORIDA'S COASTLINE ACT

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

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss H.R. 4770, the Protecting and Securing Florida's Coastline Act, making permanent the military mission line moratorium on oil and gas exploration in the eastern Gulf of Mexico.

Why we do not want offshore drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, Floridians do not want offshore drilling—no Democrats, no Republicans, no rich people, no poor people, no nobody—and here is why.

We have a tourist economy and highly developed residential coast, bays, and estuaries. There is no place for commercial infrastructure, tank farms, workboats, or offshore supply vessels.

The military doesn't want it either, hence the military mission line to protect their training and testing.

Offshore drilling led to one of the worst environmental disasters in U.S. history, the 2010 Deepwater Horizon failure, which could happen again at any time. It put 215 million gallons of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. The effects are still being felt.

And you have got to remember, tourism generates $50 billion a year in Florida.

THANKING JAY CHO FOR HIS HARD WORK AND DEDICATION

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank one of my longest serving staff members, Jay Cho, who will be departing my team this Friday.

Jay volunteered to be part of my very first intern class. Jay grew to be a vital piece of my operation, and in no short time, I asked him to join my staff in a permanent capacity.

He climbed through the ranks of my office, serving as my legislative assistant and right hand in handling technology issues for the Oversight and Government Reform Committee's IT Subcommittee.

Jay is the kind of person this Congress and country need more of. Forging relationships on both sides of the aisle, his efforts were critical in passing legislation to modernize government technology and make government websites mobile friendly.

I am honored to have had the privilege to work with Jay, and on behalf of the people of Illinois he served for nearly 5 years, I would like to thank him for his hard work and dedication.

CELEBRATING A PROMISE KEPT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a promise kept to the American people: bigger paychecks for 2 million people and counting.

Because of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, pay increases for 90 percent of American workers are coming in February. For families in eastern Washington and across the country, many living paycheck to paycheck who have felt left behind, this is a big deal.

Imagine being that single mom who wakes up every day, takes her kids to school, goes to work, and shops in downtown Spokane. For her, a bigger paycheck will mean she will have more money in her pocket every single month. If she wants, she will be able to save a little bit more so she can go back to school, buy a car, even throw a little into her kids' lunchbox.

Mr. Speaker, the hardworking men and women of this country have been waiting for a fighting chance to get ahead, and that is what this Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is delivering. I invite all Americans to learn more at fairandsimple.gop.

LET'S GET A CLEAN DREAM ACT

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to share the story of Miguel from Salem, Oregon, and to once again urge Republican leadership to put aside partisan politics and include a clean Dream Act in this week's short-term budget extension.

Miguel was brought to the United States when he was 7 years old by his parents. For years, he lived in the shadows, not knowing whether college would ever be an option for him. In 2012, Miguel, along with nearly 800,000 young folks in this country, was able to apply for DACA; and thanks to DACA, he was able to earn not one, but two bachelor's degrees. He now works as a human resource manager for a business in Salem.

Miguel pays taxes and he contributes to our community. Miguel's future is uncertain due to the congressional Republican leadership's unwillingness to allow a vote on the Dream Act.

Every day, another 122 DACA recipients like Miguel lose their legal protections that allow them to go to school and to work. It is inhumane that Congress continues to hold these young folks hostage for partisan political purposes.

Let's do the right thing. Let's get a clean Dream Act passed so this country can move forward.

RECOGNIZING THREE WHO SERVE LOCAL ARIZONA GOVERNMENT

(Mr. BIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three individuals who serve in local government in Arizona: Steve Chucri, Brigette Peterson, and Nora Ellen.

This month, Steve Chucri's colleagues on the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors voted to elevate him to chairman of the board. Steve has served on that board since 2013.

Last week, the Gilbert Town Council chose Brigette Peterson as their vice mayor. Brigette has served on the council since 2015.

Last Thursday, the Chandler City Council voted to appoint Nora Ellen as their vice mayor. Nora has served on the council since 2013.

Mr. Speaker, serving in local government isn't always glamorous, but these individuals and their colleagues demonstrate commitment to their constituents on a daily basis. Our communities are fortunate to have Steve, Brigette, and Nora at these posts. I wish them well in their new roles and look forward to working with them in 2018.

KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OPEN

(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, Republicans have got to start working with Democrats to govern. We can't keep moving from one shutdown crisis to the next.

Here is what we can do today, right now:

First, we can work together to keep the Federal Government open by pursuing bipartisan priorities of the American people; funding community health centers, permanently reauthorizing CHIP, providing disaster relief, and protecting DREAMers. Let's do that, not for politics, but for people.

Second, we can work together on a Federal budget that raises caps for domestic spending. We should increase veterans funding so there is not a single veteran left behind in our great Nation.

We need to protect pensions, provide the disaster relief funds for hurricane and wildfire victims, create good-paying jobs and full-time jobs for American workers, and protect healthcare.

Let's create a bipartisan budget that is a better deal for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is too easy these days to be partisan and cynical. Let us, instead, work together to keep the Federal Government open and functioning for the American people.

IN SUPPORT OF THE MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, this week, thousands of Americans are joining together in our Nation's Capital for a common purpose, the March for Life.

This year marks 45 years since Roe v. Wade legalized abortion in our country. Since 1974, generations of Americans have braved the elements and marched on Washington to pray for our Nation and be the voice for the most vulnerable members of our society, the unborn.

As a member of the Pro-Life Caucus, I will continue to fight for legislation that values and protects the sanctity of innocent life. I applaud these courageous participants, and I stand with you in this movement. There is no more basic human right than the right to life.

□ 1215

REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS OF WOMEN ARE UNDER ATTACK

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the absurdly titled Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

This bill is yet another attempt by the majority to intimidate women and providers of abortion care by imposing restrictions that are redundant, at best, and life-threatening, at worse. Time and again, Republicans have charged that politicians, not women and their doctors, know what is best for women's bodies. Enough is enough.

Today is a reminder that women's reproductive rights are constantly under attack, and I will never waver in fighting back. This bill is completely unnecessary. It has always been illegal to kill newborn infants, and to suggest this legislation is anything more than redundant obstruction for women accessing healthcare is outrageous.

Instead of spending time on unnecessary legislation, my Republican colleagues should work with Democrats to fund the government and protect 800,000 young people, our DREAMers, from deportation to countries they have never known.

Mr. Speaker, Americans face actual real problems every single day. So let's get back to work.

GIVE A VOICE TO UNBORN CHILDREN

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

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which was introduced by Representative MARSHA BLACKBURN.

This year marks the 45th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision, Roe v. Wade. Unfortunately, with this decision, we have seen the number of abortions occurring in the United States growing each year. According to Planned Parenthood's 2016–2017 annual report, abortions make up 96 percent of the organization's pregnancy resolution services, whereas prenatal services dropped significantly.

Additionally, Planned Parenthood has performed more than 1.6 million abortions over the past 5 years. Now, more than ever, it is crucial that we celebrate the sanctity of life by encouraging and supporting pro-life legislation. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which I am a proud cosponsor of, affirmatively states that if a baby is born after a failed abortion attempt, doctors must exercise the same degree of medical care on that child as a baby born on any other day.

If doctors refuse to do so, they will be held criminally accountable for their actions. As a proud west Tennessean, I believe we must give a voice to the unborn and preserve the life and health of all children.

RECOGNIZING ED GORIN

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend Magistrate Ed Gorin, in the First District of Kentucky, for his decades of service to the residents of Taylor County.

Ed has served his fellow citizens in many capacities throughout the years, from his membership on the local school board to spearheading local committee projects. He has always been guided by his personal motto of ''working for the community.''

Through the years, he has maintained a singular focus and worked tirelessly to better the lives of his fellow Taylor Countians by consistently searching for the most fiscally responsible solution for the greatest number of citizens—even spending money out of his own pocket for community events.

During his career, he has secured numerous benefits for Taylor County, including a volunteer fire department and a recycling program which will impact the lives of those in his community for years to come.

Ed Gorin has established an outstanding legacy as a revered public servant, and I join with his family and friends, as well as all those he has impacted during his career, to express our dedication and gratitude for his contributions to Taylor County.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent him and wish him well in his recovery efforts.

LOVE SAVES LIVES

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my excitement that this body has taken a strong pro-life stance and, likewise, that this country is becoming increasingly pro-life.

This is not surprising since it is a view that is plainly obvious that we are not talking about a clump of cells but a baby human. Advances in science and medicine make this more clear all the time.

In addition to our votes this week to save babies with the necessary medical care when they are born alive following an abortion, tomorrow my office will be welcoming and hosting pro-life leaders and friends from Ohio's Eighth District traveling to Washington, D.C., to participate in this year's March for Life.

I am proud to participate tomorrow in the march where we will seek to get out the message that love saves lives. Since Roe v. Wade, nearly 60 million babies with all their potential have had their lives tragically cut short. I look forward to the day when love and sound science finally put an end to abortion.

RECOGNIZING UDAP INDUSTRIES IN BUTTE, MONTANA

(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 recognize the critical work of UDAP Industries, a company in Butte, Montana, that produces self-defense sprays. It was founded by Mark Matheny, a survivor of a grizzly bear attack.

When you are in bear country, bear spray is critically important. Citing concerns about the ozone layer, the EPA moved, in 2015, to ban the propellant used to make bear spray shoot out of the canister. EPA suggested a replacement that was half as effective, undermining safety. Rather than give in and make a less effective, inferior product, UDAP and others petitioned the EPA to reconsider.

After my office and others worked with the EPA to waive the ban for bear spray, EPA did the right thing and waived the ban that would have created a safety hazard. I will continue working with UDAP and others to ensure that they are not burdened by unnecessary Federal regulations.

RURAL AMERICA

(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 thank President Trump for his strong support of rural America and for remembering the forgotten farmer.

Last week, the President made us so very proud when he became the first sitting President in 25 years to address the Farm Bureau. During his speech, the President emphasized the importance of agriculture in America. And as a member of the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, I could not agree more.

Our farmers provide America with food security unlike any other country on Earth. Farmers and ranchers are a small percentage of our population, feeding, fueling, and clothing our country and the rest of the world. But it hasn't been easy for them. Foreign countries cheat our farmers with unfair trade practices. Unelected bureaucrats have strangled our farmers with regulation after regulation. And even your elected officials have tried to tax our farmers to death. As a result, farm income has been on a drastic and steady decline until now.

So I thank the President for not forgetting about rural America; and I thank him for rolling back job-killing regulations, calling out corrupt trade practices, and pushing Congress to ease the burden of the death tax.

My farm friends in Mississippi thank the President.

MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, we must never forget that life is truly a gift. I rise this afternoon in support of the tens of thousands of Americans who will be here marching in Washington, D.C., tomorrow to give a voice to the voiceless.

This House consistently defends the unborn and promotes a culture of life. We have passed the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act which would ban late-term abortions at 20 weeks. We have passed legislation to prevent tax dollars from being used to pay for abortions. We voted to defund Planned Parenthood and have voted to increase funding for federally qualified community health centers that promote and provide women's health services while protecting life.

This week, I look forward to joining my colleagues in voting in favor of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Act. All of these legislative achievements are encouraging progress; however, our work is not done, and we must continue to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today for the same reasons that Americans will be marching in Washington and in west Michigan over the next few days: to defend the unborn, give voice to the voiceless, and promote a culture of respect for life from its beginning sparks to its final twilight.

RECOGNIZING CRITICAL PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our critical public health programs. Months ago, the House passed a bundle of reauthorizations for key health programs. Amongst them are funding extensions for the community health centers, CHIP, and the National Health Service Corps.

Today, we will vote for CHIP reauthorization for a third time. I will be voting ''yes'' for a third time, and it appears that most of my Democratic colleagues will be voting ''no'' for a third time. Programs like these help ensure that millions of Americans and hundreds of thousands of Nebraskans receive the care they so desperately need. It is abhorrent that these programs have become a political football, and it is unacceptable that the healthcare that so many depend on has been put to the side.

This upcoming spring, Nebraska will run out of funding for community health centers and CHIP. While a contingency plan may be in the works, these lifesaving programs should not require a fallback. I count on my colleagues in the Senate and the House to pass legislation, to vote ''yes'' today on CHIP and community health centers and many other key programs in the future.

RECOGNIZING LITTLE ROCK FIRE CHIEF GREGORY SUMMERS

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Fire Chief Gregory Summers as he retires after 35 years of service to the city of Little Rock.

Chief Summers served as the 12th fire chief for the city of Little Rock and became the department's first African-American fire chief. He was appointed chief in 2009, and his leadership has had an indelible impact on central Arkansas communities.

Under Chief Summer's leadership, the department earned Class 1 status by the Insurance Services Office and received international accreditation through the Center for Public Safety Excellence. This saves our community insurance dollars and improves safety. The Little Rock Fire Department is one of only 57 fire departments across the country to receive this recognition.

My congratulations and best wishes for Chief Summers' future endeavors.

HONORING THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA COLLEGE FOOTBALL TEAM

(Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart in the wake of the University of

Alabama's win over my beloved Georgia Bulldogs in the National College Football Playoff Championship last week.

Despite the loss, which came after an unbelievable game, the Georgia Bulldogs played their hearts out, and I am so very proud of our team. It is an honor to represent the great University of Georgia as the Representative from Georgia's 10th District and have the privilege of wearing the red and black of this outstanding institution and incredible team.

Under the leadership of awesome Head Coach Kirby Smart and a special group of young men like Nick Chubb, Sony Michel, and Jake Fromm, the Dawgs won the SEC Championship and had one of the greatest seasons that they have had in years, reaching the national championship for the first time in more than 30 years.

At the end of the day, it was a great game on both sides, and while it pains me to admit it, my friend and colleague Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL represents an outstanding football team. Congratulations to Alabama's Crimson Tide. And true to my word, I will be providing her office and her with barbecue and wearing the Alabama tie after their overtime win.

Congratulations to them for another national championship title, but for us: Go Dawgs. Go Dawgs. Go Dawgs.

MEDIA DESERVE FAKE NEWS AWARDS

(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, yesterday the President highlighted examples of media bias and irresponsible news stories. All Americans should call out purveyors of fake news and point out slanted coverage.

The President is certainly correct in using the term ''fake news'' to describe the media when they intentionally misrepresent his comments and take them out of context. They intentionally omit relevant facts and only report one side of the story, and they intentionally promote a liberal agenda.

In a democracy, the media have a profound responsibility to give the American people the facts, not tell them what to think.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4712, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 22, 2018, THROUGH JANUARY 26, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 694 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 694

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4712) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from January 22, 2018, through January 26, 2018—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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.

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. 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 gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 694, which provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This important bill ensures medical care and legal protection for abortion survivors, protects their mothers from prosecution, and holds abortion providers accountable.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not duplicative as some have suggested. It simply augments current law: the Born-Alive Infants Act and the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act, which the House passed in 2002 and 2003, respectively, with very strong bipartisan support.

Current law includes, in the Federal definition of a person, infants who are born alive no matter the method of birth or the stage of their development. Current law, Mr. Speaker, also provides criminal penalties for physicians who provide partial-birth abortions.

What current law does not provide, however, is enforceable protection for those children who are born alive after a failed abortion attempt and denied care, nor does it provide criminal penalties, Mr. Speaker, for those who perform or knowingly ignore these actions.

Mr. Speaker, there are horrific stories of children born alive during abortions and are either gruesomely left for dead or deliberately killed once born. Even more, the abortion industry is fully aware of the risk of a child being born alive during an abortion, especially if the abortion occurs once the child is gestationally 18 to 20 weeks old or more, the age at which we know a child is able to survive if given the proper neonatal care.

Take the story, Mr. Speaker, of Gianna Jessen, an abortion survivor who testified before the House Judiciary Committee in 2015. She said: ''Instead of dying, after 18 hours of being burned in my mother's womb, I was delivered alive in an abortion clinic in Los Angeles on April 6, 1977. My medical records state: 'Born alive during saline abortion' at 6 a.m.

''Thankfully, the abortionist was not at work yet. Had he been there, he would have ended my life with strangulation, suffocation, or leaving me there to die. Instead, a nurse called an ambulance, and I was rushed to a hospital. Doctors did not expect me to live.

''I did. I was later diagnosed with cerebral palsy, which was caused by a lack of oxygen to my brain while I was surviving the abortion. I was never supposed to hold my head up or walk. I do.''

She concluded: ''If abortion is about women's rights, then what were mine?''

Some abortion providers, Mr. Speaker, are unwilling to respect the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, such as Priscilla Smith, who testified at a House Judiciary Committee hearing in 2015, saying that she didn't believe it would be a violation of the previous Born-Alive Infants Protection Act if a baby were killed outside the womb as long as the baby wasn't ''viable.''

Ms. SMITH went on to assert some fetuses are never viable. She made these claims notwithstanding the fact, Mr. Speaker, that viability is not a factor, even under existing law, in determining whether an infant deserves protection under the law. The law protects infants born alive at any stage of development; and, therefore these abortion survivors are entitled to the same degree of care that would be received by any other babies of their age.

The bill we are debating today, Mr. Speaker, would impose enforceable criminal penalties for clinics that do not treat survivors with proper medical care. There is, sadly, evidence that clinics fail to provide this care.

Deborah Edge, a former abortion clinic employee, wrote an op-ed about her experience. She said: ''I was the doctor's right-hand person in the operating room, and just like those employees of Dr. Gosnell''—who we know was

one of the most horrific abortionists to date, guilty of first degree murder in the cases of at least three babies—''I saw the abortionist puncture the soft spot in the baby's head or snip its neck if it was delivered alive.''

The abortion providers, Mr. Speaker, who neglect to provide appropriate professional care to these babies, or worse, who kill them once they are born, must be held accountable.

Finally, I believe it is very important to note, to counter some of the things you will hear from the other side of the aisle, that this bill provides crucial protections for women. This bill protects women who seek abortions by prohibiting them from being prosecuted under the law.

H.R. 4712 also empowers women. It allows them to sue abortionists who don't provide protection for aborted babies who are born alive. This is very important, Mr. Speaker. Take the case of a woman named Angela who went to a clinic in Orlando, Florida, when she was 23 weeks pregnant.

Angela received pills to begin contractions to induce an abortion. After an hour of labor, Mr. Speaker, Angela delivered her baby, alive, into a toilet. Angela had her friend call 911 to request help to save her baby, but when the paramedics arrived on the scene, clinic staff reportedly turned them away. The fire department's incident report said they had no contact with the patient.

After the death of her son, Rowan, Angela wrote the following: ''The very moment I saw my son was alive, nothing else in the whole world mattered but Rowan's safety . . . Only one thing mattered to me: getting Rowan help. I begged repeatedly.''

Tragically, the abortion clinic not only refused but also, apparently, sabotaged Angela's call for help.

The bill that we are debating today, Mr. Speaker, would give women like Angela the ability to sue abortionists who do not comply with the law's requirements to give medical attention to children born alive like baby Rowan.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule to allow consideration of H.R. 4712, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today we will consider the 61st closed rule of the Congress, part of a disturbing and familiar pattern. Republicans are running this House with no regular order, no hearings on legislation, and one closed rule after another. Speaker RYAN and House Republicans recently set a record as presiding over the most closed session of Congress in history, and now they are adding to it.

With no transparency and their continued effort to silence any debate or dissent, this House Chamber feels more like the Russian house rather than the people's House. Now, I know Donald Trump is enthralled with authoritarian rulers and authoritarian rule, but that doesn't mean you guys have to follow suit.

Today's rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 4712, yet another partisan and extreme Republican bill that is completely unnecessary and aimed solely at pleasing the majority's right-wing base. The simple truth is that this bill is filled with inflammatory language intentionally designed to politicize women's access to healthcare. It is clearly about nothing more than advancing an agenda to take away access to safe and legal abortion.

With this bill, House Republicans are meddling in the decisions that should be left up to doctors and patients. That is not our job. What we are doing today is not about serious legislating. If it were, the majority would have gone through regular order. This bill is nothing more than a very cynical effort to give Republican Members of Congress something to point to when they join the anti-choice march in Washington this week. Republicans are recklessly playing politics with women's health, and they should be ashamed.

My Republican colleagues claim that this bill is just a reinstatement of the current born-alive law. First, if that were true, then this bill would be redundant and unnecessary; and, second, Democrats would support it. When the original law came to the House floor in 2002, it was passed by a voice vote. We all agreed. But this bill is not a reinstatement.

This bill takes the current, functional law and adds a radical inclusion of criminal penalties for doctors if they violate the unreasonable requirements of this legislation.

Under current law, when a child is born alive, including during an abortion procedure, the healthcare provider is required to care for this newborn and apply a standard level of care given to any and every child. However, this bill takes the law a step further and requires that the doctor immediately transport this child to a hospital, without exception, whether it is safe for the child or not, or face criminal punishment—up to 5 years in jail.

This bill could create a chilling effect and limit access to safe, legal abortion for women since physicians may fear prosecution. Patients need and deserve access to compassionate and appropriate medical care. This bill is, quite frankly, unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, there are times when immediately transporting a newborn to a hospital that may be miles or even hours away may result in grave harm to that infant. Such decisions must be left to the professional judgment of doctors and clinicians.

Doctors and clinicians oppose this law because it prevents them from giving the best care to their patients. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists strongly oppose this legislation, calling it a ''gross interference in the practice of medicine.''

Current law is working and should not be radically changed for a partisan talking point. Right now there are a number of truly critical issues that we ought to be considering on this floor, not a sound bite for an anti-choice rally coming up in the next couple of days.

A clear majority of Americans, I should point out to my colleagues, seven out of ten, say they believe a woman should have the right to a safe, legal abortion according to a Quinnipiac University poll. By stark contrast, fewer than three in ten Americans—that is 29 percent—approve of the job Republicans are doing in Congress. Maybe the majority ought to get the hint. People don't like what you are doing. This should be a wake-up call to Republicans to end their partisan crusades and start doing their jobs. It is time to focus on the real pressing issues we face.

The Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP, which nearly 2 million kids and their families rely on, has been in limbo for months as States are beginning to run out of money. Now Republicans are pushing a continuing resolution that fails to permanently extend CHIP. Permanently extending CHIP would not only give these kids and their families the certainty they need when it comes to their healthcare, but the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says that it would also save $6 billion. I thought the majority were the party of fiscal responsibility. Do the right thing and save $6 billion. But Republicans would rather kick the can down the road once again.

The authorizations for Community Health Center funds and the Maternal, Infant, and Childhood Home Visitation programs will remain expired. That is not even included in this partisan CR that we are going to see a little bit later today.

Each and every day, 122 DREAMers are losing their protected status and ability to work in this country, and my Republican friends don't seem at all bothered by that.

People who are first responders, saving lives, people who serve in our military and people who work in our companies who are such great members of our community are treated like this in such a rotten way, and yet more inaction.

The administration just stripped 200,000 Salvadorans legally residing in the United States of their protected status, people who are obeying our laws and who are working here legally.

□ 1245

They did this while admonishing Congress to provide these same people with an enduring lawful immigration status; and yet, we have a Congress that is so dysfunctional, they can't even agree on what to have for lunch,

never mind move anything forward that is positive with regard to protecting these important members of our community.

The debt limit needs to be raised to ensure the U.S. is able to pay its bills. Communities are urgently in need of resources to fight the opioid epidemic that is killing 91 Americans a day.

They are tired of your press releases. They want the funding to be able to respond to the crisis in their communities; yet, nothing in this CR, no urgency here in Congress.

More needs to be done to help repair damage left by devastating wildfires and hurricanes that have ravaged this country. I just came back from a trip to Puerto Rico. The place is still in great disrepair, and our initial response to that hurricane was disgraceful. We have a special obligation to these people, our fellow citizens, to better respond; yet, there is no urgency here.

Most importantly, where is the budget agreement that sets the caps for fiscal year 2018? House and Senate appropriators can't even begin negotiations on an omnibus funding bill until they know the top-line numbers.

That means that this will not be the last short-term continuing resolution that we see before this House. Until there is an agreement on the budget caps, we will continue to see the Republican majority keep kicking the can down the road. We will see CR No. 5 in mid-February and maybe CR No. 6 shortly thereafter.

When will the Republicans finally stop negotiating with themselves and instead reach out to Democrats and work in a bipartisan way and actually get the job done that we were sent here to do by our constituents?

We are just hours away from another Republican shutdown, and instead of working on a bipartisan agreement, we are here discussing this inflammatory bill that will impose criminal penalties on doctors and allow Congress to intrude on medical care decisions.

When are we going to put the radical rhetoric aside and do our jobs and tackle the real issues that the Americans sent us here to tackle?

Here is kind of the icing on the cake. This government shutdown is looming. We are going to run out of money on Friday. All hell is going to break loose if we can't come to some sort of agreement. You would think we would be working together to get this done as quickly as possible.

But then we are told we are going to consider the continuing resolution rule after this and then we are going to debate it, but we are not going to vote on it until later night, after 7, maybe even later.

Why, people might ask, are we delaying action on a bill that decides whether we keep the government open?

Oh, we just found out President Trump is doing a political rally with Republican Members of Congress in Pennsylvania.

So the political rally is more important than the well-being of the American people?

What are you guys thinking?

Shame on you. This is a moment of urgency and instead of doing political sound bite legislation and instead of doing political rallies in Pennsylvania for an election that doesn't happen until March, Members of Congress ought to be here, working to keep the government running, to come to some sort of accommodation on the DREAMers, to make sure community health centers are funded, to make sure our veterans get the funding and the healthcare they need.

What you are doing is atrocious. If the American people could sue you for political malpractice, you would be in deep trouble.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, to oppose this bill that would severely undermine women's access to essential services like abortion, and I urge my colleagues to cancel the political rally and get back to work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not engage in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. Speaker, I compliment my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mr. MCGOVERN. We have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to spend a number of hours together up in the Rules Committee. It is always great to manage debates with Mr. MCGOVERN on the other side of the aisle because you are left with, number one, no doubt about where he stands. But number two, a target-rich environment as well, Mr. Speaker.

I would just say a couple of things. First of all, casting aspersions on this bill when my colleagues say this bill is nothing more than a political stunt or a political sound bite or a partisan talking point, I can't imagine, Mr. Speaker, that they really believe that describing legislation—they may disagree with the legislation—but for us to have to be on the floor of this body talking about babies who are born alive and who are killed at the hands of abortionists is far more than a political sound bite.

I think Mr. MCGOVERN, my colleague, was saying that we ought to be ashamed of ourselves. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that is rhetoric that we don't need and rhetoric that is absolutely inaccurate in terms of describing the important efforts that we have underway here.

I also would hope, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues in the other body, in particular, the Democrats in the other body—Mr. SCHUMER and the others over there—were watching Mr. MCGOVERN just now. If the issue really is, Let's get to work and let's get a deal done, that deal is in their hands.

Mr. MCGOVERN well knows that you have got to get 60 votes in the United States Senate to get a deal. We are in the position today where, of the long list of items Mr. MCGOVERN mentioned, I would say he failed to mention the single most important obligation we have, which is to ensure that we get resources to our military.

The reality of the situation we are facing today, at a moment when our Nation faces grave threats, at a moment where we are having servicemen and -women killed in training accidents—more killed in training accidents in the last year than were killed in combat in the last year—we in this body have failed to do our duty.

The reality of this, for people to understand, is that the Democrats in the United States Senate are holding funding for defense hostage because they want amnesty for illegal immigrants. That, Mr. Speaker, is something that I think is absolutely indefensible.

So I hope that Mr. MCGOVERN's colleagues in the Senate were watching him, were listening to the concern he has about the sense of urgency with moving forward.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we could have a deal today, if the Democrats would stop holding spending hostage, stop holding the resources our military needs hostage in order to grant amnesty for illegal immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my friend and colleague and the sponsor of this bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you it is an honor to come to the floor and talk about one of these protected rights: life.

When we talk about our founding documents and life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, it is life that we are protecting.

I find it unfortunate that we have some who would say this is a radical talking point. I would offer that the right to life is a fundamental right, not a talking point.

Now, what brings us to this point in time?

We all remember the stories of Kermit Gosnell, the abortionist, the house of horrors, and what happened there, where individuals—moms—lost their lives, where one of the workers in that clinic estimated that there had been as many as 100 babies through the years that had survived an abortion and had been killed.

What we are seeking to do is expand these protections. Today, what we are doing with H.R. 4712 is to build on that legislation from 2002. This body had passed that legislation to protect infants that were born alive and had survived abortions.

This bill before us today is going to do four very important things.

First, it requires appropriate care be given to any child who is born alive following a failed abortion. It requires any health providers present to administer the same life-preserving care that would be given to babies born under any other circumstances and to ensure

that the child is transported immediately to a hospital.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Second, the bill establishes criminal penalties that providers will face if they violate providing that care.

Third, it establishes a civil right of action to enforce the law.

Finally, the bill provides crucial protections that will prevent mothers of these babies from being subject to criminal prosecution and penalties.

Mr. Speaker, these are the right steps to protect the most vulnerable among us. I encourage support for the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleague from Wyoming that I will point out a little statistic that she might be interested in. That is, I think never in history has the government been shut down when the same party controls the House, the Senate, and the White House, like the Republicans do right now. The Republicans have a 23-seat majority, I think, in the House right now. You control the agenda.

If the gentlewoman or her leadership were interested in working with Democrats, here is a little advice: maybe you ought to have asked us to the table. Maybe you should consult with us. Maybe you should ask us what we think is important. Maybe you ought to understand that if you want to get something done that is bipartisan, you have to act in a bipartisan way.

The reason why I am anxious to get this vote on the CR is because I think the CR that has been proposed is wholly inadequate. It is not in the best interest of our country.

But I want us to continue to negotiate it. Maybe the Republicans will come back to the table and negotiate. That is why I feel so strongly that my Republican friends ought not be going to political rallies in Pennsylvania today with the President and they ought to be staying here to do the work to make sure we get a bipartisan agreement to keep the government open.

I get it. You are losing seats all around the place. The popularity of the Republican Party has never been lower. You are all panicked. But the election isn't until March. Donald Trump can take all of you on his luxurious plane to Pennsylvania at another time. But today, we ought to be focused on the people's business. Next week, we are supposed to be off. So you have all the time in the world next week to be able to go with Donald Trump on a political excursion.

When I think about what is at stake and we are delaying votes on a continuing resolution and on further negotiations because people are more interested in the political rally in Pennsylvania, this takes my breath away.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are back to the House floor today to pass another bill, the real intent of which is to harm women and limit their constitutionally protected healthcare they can receive. I need to repeat that because most people I find do not understand that the Constitution of the United States, which we revere, protects a woman's right to choose.

To add insult to injury, this intrusive legislation is totally unnecessary. Killing an infant, or anybody else, has always been against the law.

To reiterate the point, a bipartisan law was passed in 2002 to reinforce that medical care should be given to any infant born alive. To illustrate how unnecessary this bill is, Dr. Kermit Gosnell, who is the only example we have in America, is going to spend the rest of his life in prison without any possibility of parole for three first-degree murder convictions.

But H.R. 4712 goes much further than the current law. It legislates medical standards of care and threatens the providers with civil and criminal penalties.

The effects of this are best described by an OB/GYN from my district:

''I have been a practicing OB/GYN for more than 35 years, and it is my life's calling to care for women across their lifespan. Throughout my career, I have cared for patients during their highest highs and lowest lows, from healthy pregnancies to devastating fetal anomalies, to cancer diagnoses. I take my role as their trusted physician very seriously, and take pride in providing compassionate and ethical care to each and every patient.

''H.R. 4712 would take that ability away from me, inserting politicians into the patient-physician relationship and the profoundly personal healthcare decisions of my patients.

''Recently, I had a patient with severe HELLP syndrome, a life-threatening blood pressure condition during pregnancy for which the only treatment is to deliver. This meant induction of her previable fetus to save her life.

□ 1300

''As her condition deteriorated, and after consulting her family, spiritual leader, and several specialists, she decided to deliver''—she should be able to consult whomever she pleases—''knowing that her extremely preterm infant would not survive. If enacted, H.R. 4712 would take away this family's choice of providing comfort care for their baby, put my patient's life at risk, and threaten me with criminal and civil penalties for providing appropriate and empathetic care to my patients.''

H.R. 4712 is just the next bill in a long line of votes that we have had here that would hurt women.

But Congress is just part of the current crusade against women. This administration has done more than its share to ensure that 2017 saw an unprecedented amount of attacks against women and our ability to access healthcare.

Just this morning—America, please don't lose the irony in this. Just this morning, the administration announced a rule to allow providers, hospitals, nurses, and others to refuse patients needed healthcare based solely on the religious or moral beliefs of the provider.

Is it just me who thinks that is in direct contradiction to this bill they are trying to push off on us now? On the one hand, they are saying everything has to be treated, and, on the other hand, they are saying you don't have to treat anybody if your personal or moral convictions prevent you from doing so. That is really dangerous, believe me. This is an unconscionable effort to blatantly ignore the needs and the best interests of the patients.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. This silly rule will put individuals' lives and health in danger and will result in deaths, based on an undefined moral objection. It doesn't even have to be explained that they have some idea that they would not be able to treat that person who may be bleeding to death before them.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to close again with the words from the OB/GYN from my district:

''The purpose of this legislation is to scare and intimidate physicians and punish them for providing abortion care, but the true impact will be on the women and families who will be denied the highest quality medical treatment they deserve.

''H.R. 4712 is a dangerous bill. I urge you to protect my patients' access to care and reject this gross interference in the patient-physician relationship.''

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, the whole idea of this bill is a political issue. But the idea of what the administration did this morning, to completely negate this bill that we are debating right now, is irony that is just too delicious to miss.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the strongest, most honorable and admirable defenders of life in this body, my friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, doctors, today, routinely diagnose and treat a myriad of illnesses and diseases suffered by societies' littlest patients—unborn babies

and newborns—significantly enhancing both the children's health and longevity.

Abortionists, on the other hand, take a different approach. They dismember and chemically kill unborn children for profit. For decades, babies have survived later term abortions. As far back as 37 years ago, a Philadelphia Inquirer story called baby survival ''the dreaded complication.''

Dr. Willard Cates of the Center for Disease Control said live births ''are little known because organized medicine, from fear of public clamor and legal action, treats them more as an embarrassment to be hushed up than a problem to be solved. It is like turning yourself in to the IRS for an audit. What is there to gain? The tendency is not to report because there are only negative incentives.''

Of course, the tendency is not to report.

When an undercover investigator asked another abortion provider from Planned Parenthood about the procedure for checking for signs of life in a baby born after an attempted abortion, the abortionist responded by saying: ''I mean, the key is, you need to pay attention to who is in the room. . . . ''

Philadelphia abortionist Kermit Gosnell had a lot of people in the room, but nobody was reporting, as he killed and snipped the spinal cords of hundreds of born babies to ensure that they didn't survive.

All is not well in the abortion clinics either, in terms of their own personnel. The National Public Radio, NPR, did an incisive story featuring former Planned Parenthood Director Abby Huffman, who is now Johnson, who is now pro-life, and her outreach to clinical workers encouraging them to quit their jobs inside the abortion clinics.

Heard on ''All Things Considered,'' Annette Lancaster, a former manager of Planned Parenthood in North Carolina, said her abortion work made her feel ''dark and morbid.'' Annette said she was troubled by the way she and other workers referred to fetal remains. She said: ''I just now started being able to use my deep freezer in my home by going through therapy, because we used to call the freezer the 'nursery.'" That is to say for the dead babies.

The National Abortion Federation, in their textbook for abortionists, says:

''Providers should consider the possibility of a live-born fetus, particularly if fetal death is not induced prior to the procedure and the gestational age is 18 to 20 weeks or more.''

''Besides the emotional and ethical difficulties for patients, their partners, and staff, a delivery with signs of life may have legal implications.''

The problem with existing law, Mr. Speaker, is enforcement—the lack of legal implications.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. MARSHA BLACKBURN's bill, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, requires, under penalty of law, that appropriate healthcare to be given to any child who survives an attempted abortion, not looking the other way, as has been done for decades—Gosnell probably being the most egregious example.

The law prescribes that:

''Any healthcare practitioner present at the time the child is born shall exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious healthcare practitioner would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age; following the exercise of skill, care, and diligence . . . ensure that the child born alive is immediately transported to a hospital.''

The bill also establishes strong criminal penalties for practitioners who violate this requirement; establishes a civil right of action for the mother of the child, to enforce the law; and the mother of the child born alive may not be prosecuted under this law.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are, again, at a very urgent moment here for our country. We have a lot to do, and we ought to be working in a bipartisan way to keep the government open. That ought to be everybody's priority. Quite frankly, we ought to be focused on that more than on a bill that is a sound bite that is going nowhere.

In fact, this bill was so important to my Republican friends that it never had a hearing or it never went through a markup. It just miraculously appeared at the last minute in advance of this anti-choice rally coming up.

But with all that is going on right now, I mean, with the threat of a shutdown, I am looking at Donald Trump's tweet:

''Will be going to Pennsylvania today in order to give my total support to Rick Saccone, running for Congress in a special election (March 13). Rick is a great guy.''

That is where the President's head is today. And he is taking a bunch of Republicans with him. Rather than negotiating a bipartisan deal that will help keep the government running, that will help the DREAMers, that will help our kids, that will help community health centers, that will help our hospitals, and that will help our veterans, the focus is on a political rally in Pennsylvania. This is unbelievable. Cancel the rally—you have until March 13—and, instead, focus on the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), the co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, this bill imposes dangerous new standards of care on doctors under threat of criminal penalties, including up to 5 years in jail. It is just another attempt by the majority to interfere with the medical judgment of doctors and other trained healthcare professionals, and it is, frankly, another example of why it is such a very, very bad idea for Congress to be legislating medical standards.

H.R. 4712 is also a solution in search of a problem. There is simply no evidence that current law is insufficient to protect infants.

It should go without saying that it has always been illegal to kill newborns. It is a complete distortion of the truth to say anything otherwise.

In 2002, as my colleagues have said, Congress reaffirmed that infants are entitled to appropriate medical care under a law that passed on a bipartisan basis. I voted for it. That law left medical judgment where it should be: in the hands of doctors, instead of politicians.

Today, the only example that we have heard from the other side of a horror that they are talking about was Dr. Kermit Gosnell, and it was a horror.

And guess what?

He was prosecuted under current law.

And guess what?

He is spending the rest of his life in prison, which is where he should be.

Sadly, the true intent of this bill is to intimidate and shame doctors out of providing comprehensive reproductive healthcare to patients.

The extreme and vague requirements of this bill, coupled with its stiff criminal and civil penalties, are only meant to have a chilling effect on providers, which will reduce access to safe and legal abortion.

Do you know what? I have been saying this every time we have one of these bills on the floor—the bills that are solutions in search of problems. Here is what I have to say, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: If they truly want to reduce abortion in this country, work with us on providing family planning and long-acting birth control to everybody.

Abortion is at the lowest rate in history in this country, and the reason is because States, like my State of Colorado, are providing birth control to prevent unwanted pregnancies. We can do this on a bipartisan basis, but, instead, my colleagues choose not to, and I think that is a shame for every single woman and family in this country.

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

Mr. Speaker, I understand why my colleague on the other side of the aisle doesn't want the President to be traveling to Pennsylvania. He doesn't want him to be traveling, I am sure, to any battleground States. It didn't work out very well for his party in 2016, when the President, very effectively, did just that all over the country.

I would also say that it is brave for my colleague to read a tweet of the President here on the House floor. I think the last time that the two of us were here together, we discussed the fact that it was a tweet from the President that scared his leadership away

from a crucial meeting at the White House to negotiate the budget cap deal, to negotiate exactly the deal that he is now so anxious to get done.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that work is underway. I can assure you that we could have a deal right now today if—and I will repeat it once again. I know my colleague is going to say that the Republicans control the Senate. But he knows, and I know, Mr. Speaker, that the rules of the Senate require 60 votes to get something done. That means today that if CHUCK SCHUMER and the Democrats in the Senate are unwilling to agree to the cap deal, they are unwilling to provide the resources that we need to fund the military, the resources to make sure our men and women in uniform can defend the Nation, because they are holding out, and they are holding that hostage over amnesty. We could get it done today if they would be willing simply to come to the table and compromise and stop holding our troops hostage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this important bill to the floor.

We have heard it mentioned that, in 2002, in a bipartisan way, we already have law that a baby born alive, at any stage of gestation, any weeks of life, born alive, it is already illegal to kill the baby, and that was a bipartisan bill; so I can understand why my friends on the other side of the aisle want to keep changing the subject. Every vote today should be for this bill.

We have already agreed that you have to save the lives of these children. The problem is that we don't have strong enforcement mechanisms. This bill provides enforcement mechanisms. This bill specifies any medical care. This should be a unanimous vote.

That is what we need to talk about here today—in fact, life begins at conception—to have laws that protect babies born alive. Now, remember, these are babies who are born alive. There have been questions about whether or not it happens.

Melissa Ohden, who testified in the Judiciary Committee a couple of years ago, was a baby born alive. She started her own network, the Abortion Survivors Network, where she has had contact with 203 other abortion survivors.

Sometimes when they go in to start the abortion, they start the treatments, the dilation, and the chemical treatments, the baby comes out alive. I know people listening to this here today might believe that this is a horror story and that this doesn't happen. It happens in America.

We need to fight this, make it illegal, and pass this bill, so that those babies are given the same protection as any other child who is alive. This is a no-brainer. The only shame today is that when this vote is cast later, if there are not 435 ''yes'' votes on that board today, that should be the shame of this situation. These are live babies. This is a no-brainer bill.

I am proud to represent the State of West Virginia, where respect for human life is cherished. Every Member of this body should respect human life. If it is already law, you should have no problem voting for it. That is all the more reason to support the bill before us today.

The voters of this country have elected us to do the job of the pro-life majority. It is time we pass bills like this, and more bills like this, so that we can show people we care about the unborn children.

□ 1315

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

Let me respond to the gentlewoman from Wyoming because I just want to make sure I am clear here.

There are less than 35 hours left before the government shuts down. I think that is a pretty big deal that should concern Republicans and Democrats.

I want to be clear. I don't care if the President goes to Pennsylvania. He can fly on his nice jet, enjoy lifestyles of the rich and famous or whatever he does, and go anywhere he wants in this country. I don't care where he travels to.

What we object to is the fact that this House is going to recess during this critical time so that he can bring along a whole bunch of Republican Members of Congress to be part of a political event at this crucial moment when the government is about to shut down. I find that astonishing.

The gentlewoman talks about how we owe it to the men and women in uniform to make sure we support our military. Do you think our men and women in uniform want us to take a break right now so that Republican Members can join the President on his fancy jet and go to Pennsylvania for a political rally? Is that where the priorities of this Republican majority really are?

I guess it is a habit. The last time we almost had a shutdown, in December, the Republicans took a break so that they could go to the White House for a party to celebrate their tax bill.

I am sorry. I know a lot of Republicans in my district and across the country who I don't think prioritize parties and political rallies over us doing our business. Either postpone the political rally or have the President go without Members of Congress. But the idea to recess until after 7 at this crucial moment when so much is in the balance I find just unbelievably beyond the pale.

Mr. Speaker, for months the majority has been holding the healthcare of 9 million children and over 9 million individuals, including seniors and pregnant women, hostage while they passed tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires. Well, time is up. With each day that we fail to act, our constituents face uncertain times. It is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, even President Trump says he agrees that we need to act on CHIP. Just this morning he tweeted: ''CHIP should be part of a long-term solution, not a 30-day or a short-term extension.''

Well, here is the chance to stop playing politics with CHIP—and community health centers as well—and do just that. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative MCEACHIN's bill, H.R. 4820, the Advancing Seniors and Kids Act.

This bill would restore certainty and stability to so many of our vulnerable citizens by responsibly addressing critical healthcare priorities. It permanently reauthorizes CHIP; it reauthorizes community health centers for 2 years; and it includes other vital healthcare programs that provide relief to pregnant women, seniors, and many more.

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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, my Advancing Seniors and Kids Act would permanently reauthorize CHIP, fund community health centers, prevent damaging cuts to our safety net hospitals, and make other changes that protect the health of children, seniors, and our most vulnerable friends and neighbors.

For months, Congress has failed to act on these issues, and the result has been completely avoidable pain and suffering. Right now, Americans wake up every day and worry: How much longer will my child, my family members have healthcare?

Mr. Speaker, we can take that fear away right now. Extending CHIP and funding community health centers, these are commonsense policies with bipartisan support. We should have passed clean extensions a long time ago, but we can make amends right now.

We know that healthcare coverage saves lives. We know that CHIP covers almost 9 million children. It is critically important that we do the right thing. If we let CHIP lapse, if we do not protect hospitals and community centers, there will be horrible consequences for families across this country.

Today more Americans have coverage than ever before. Medical bankruptcies are a lot less common than they were in the past. We are making progress.

I am urging my colleagues to build on that progress and not to abandon it.

A solution is right here in front of us. I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and join me in supporting quality and affordable healthcare for all Americans.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague from Massachusetts is so concerned about the government shutdown, about children's health, about providing relief for healthcare, then I assume that he will be voting ''yes'' for the CR that comes to the floor later today, which, in fact, does extend CHIP, which, in fact, does help to provide relief from the terrible medical device tax, and which will keep the government open. I think that, if he wants to make sure that his objectives are met, there is a simple solution to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, there are some issues we debate here in the House that, frankly, should not be a matter of question in anyone's mind. One of those is whether or not a baby born and is outside of the womb deserves protection.

Sometimes abortion attempts fail and babies are born alive: its heart is beating, muscles moving, and lungs working. Tragically, some abortion providers then kill these infants directly or through neglect and exposure, and this is unconscionable.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act says that a baby who survives an abortion must be treated at a hospital with the same care as a baby born alive naturally at the same state of pregnancy. The bill includes criminal sanctions against any abortion provider who kills a baby born alive.

Mr. Speaker, killing a baby outside of the womb is unquestionably the taking of an innocent human life. I urge unanimous support of Representative BLACKBURN's bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentlewoman from Wyoming that I am not going to vote for the CR because it doesn't do anything for community health centers and doesn't do anything to alleviate the burden of DSH payments for the hospitals that provide to vulnerable communities and doesn't fund Veterans Health the way we want it to. There is a whole bunch of stuff.

I just want this process to move forward so we can get back to negotiating and actually get a deal that is bipartisan that we all can be proud of. That is why—tell your Members: Please don't go on this political rally today. Instead, let's keep this House going and let's do the people's work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my, my, my, here we go again, Republicans playing politics with deeply personal healthcare decisions that belong between women and their physicians.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is not going to save lives. It is going to wrench us back to the dark days of coat hanger medicine where women were killed and maimed in back alleys.

This legislation has one aim: intimidate good and decent doctors; threaten them with imprisonment if they dare to perform a legal abortion, exercising their own medical judgment and with the consent of their patient.

I strongly oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the women of this country are watching. We will not go back.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot about how we can't do two things at once around here. We have 435 Members of the House of Representatives. We have multiple committees. There are negotiations going on in other rooms right now, but there is no time to do this important piece of legislation to stop infanticide in this country. It is like, wow, can Members of Congress not walk and chew gum at the same time?

I would invite my Democratic colleagues: Here, try some gum. We need to do this.

This empowers nurses. This empowers those assistants who see something that is terribly wrong with an abortion that went wrong and they have a chance. Instead, they have to clandestinely sneak out that surviving baby and take them somewhere else because they can't get the care they need; they might get in trouble from their boss.

What kind of country is that? Why is this even a debate in a civilized country in 2018 that you wouldn't do everything you can, after the already difficult or bad decision on an abortion, that a baby who survived, that we are not going to do everything we can to swoop it away and help it survive? What are we talking about here? This is unbelievable to me.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass this legislation and empower those nurses, empower those assistants who see what is wrong and allow them to do the right thing.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor on this. I want to make sure that people know that I am an original cosponsor of the underlying bill. I support the underlying bill. I have signed on to every piece of pro-life legislation that I can find, and I came here to save as many lives as we can.

My question out here is: What do you have to do to break out of the straightjacket of incrementalism and get to actually saving numbers of lives?

My hat is off to Jill Stanek. She brought this bill a long way. We are going to honor her today on the vote on the final passage of the bill.

But I am putting up a procedural vote, a ''no'' vote on the rule today, because we have 170 cosponsors on the Heartbeat bill. I have gone to every meeting. Nobody brought this bill up as the premier bill, and somehow, one outside organization came in and lobbied to put this ahead. It had 61 cosponsors instead of 170. There has been no hearing.

I am for the bill. Attach them both together. Let's save all the lives we can. But if nobody has the courage to step up and say what is wrong with this process, then we're never going to fix the process.

So I am going to vote ''no'' on the rule. I won't ask anybody else to do that. I will vote ''yes'' on the underlying bill, and I will go back to work to save as many lives as we possibly can.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa: the process stinks.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some outrageous arguments from our colleagues on the other side in the last hour or so. I have heard things like the argument that this is unnecessarily legislating medical standards. They said that this should be a matter of medical judgment. Really?

A commitment to the sanctity of every single human life is essential to who we are as Americans and, more fundamental than that, who we are as human beings.

They have also argued that this is a solution in search of a problem, but they ignore the data. According to the CDC, between 2003 and 2014, 588 of the infant deaths reported included a record that the cause of death was ''termination of pregnancy affecting a fetus and a newborn.'' The CDC acknowledges that this could be an underestimate.

I can tell you from my own experience, firsthand, over two decades litigating against the abortion industry in Louisiana that that industry always underreports their numbers of terminations and, certainly, their complications.

Just yesterday, I spoke with my friend Brandi in Baton Rouge. She is, herself, a survivor of a failed abortion attempt. She was left to die, and now she lives with severe disabilities because of that. She is a passionate advocate for life. Mr. Speaker, every single one of us should be.

The most important responsibility of a just government is to defend the defenseless. With the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, it is necessary to protect the most vulnerable in our society, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the opposing of the rule and opposing of H.R. 4712 to support the right of a woman to choose and to support loving families.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule and the underlying bill.

I strongly oppose this latest attempt by the Republican House majority to limit women's rights to safe and legal abortions.

H.R. 4712 amends the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act—a 2002 law that the pro-choice community did not oppose.

This bill, however, adds penalties to the law and an entirely new section in which Congress attempts to intrude directly into medical practice of abortion care for anti-choice ideological purposes.

Anti-choice lawmakers say this new bill is necessary because some babies ''survive'' abortion procedures.

They cite the now-discredited videos attacking Planned Parenthood as their evidence.

Of course, such allegations are untrue: newborns already have many legal protections, and there is no similarity between safe, legal abortion care and infanticide.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem.

No evidence of lawbreaking has been uncovered that necessitates congressional involvement.

Abortion practice is safe, legal, and humane; any evidence of wrongdoing can and should be handled under existing law.

If there is ever a case of harm or mistreatment of newborns, then of course, it should be investigated and prosecuted.

No such case exists here.

That makes it even clearer that H.R. 4712 must have other purposes; we believe the bill's true goals are to inflame the public with outrageous accusations, to interfere with medical care, and to intimidate doctors out of practice.

This legislation is consistent with the assaults that the Trump Administration and anti-abortion members of Congress in both the House and Senate have been undertaking throughout the 115th Congress and show no signs of ending.

The bill intrudes into medical practice, its mandate is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to five years in prison and the threat of financially crippling lawsuits—that one can only conclude that H.R. 4712 hopes to intimidate abortion providers out of practice.

This interference in medical care could also cause tremendous additional grief to some families making difficult decisions in heartbreaking cases.

We would not tolerate similar intrusion by politicians into any other medical specialty; abortion care is no different.

Finally, it is important to put this legislation into the proper context.

We are in the midst of an unprecedented assault against reproductive rights: this bill is just one in a litany to restrict a woman's right to choose while using women as political pawns with an extremist, anti-choice base.

Instead of spending time attempting to roll back women's constitutionally protected rights, this House should be advancing legislation that will reform our truly broken immigration and criminal justice systems.

The bill before us is offered for a simple purpose; to sensationalize opposition to abortion and serve as a political decoy to shut down our government.

The United States Supreme Court ruled over 40 years ago, in Roe v. Wade (410 U.S. 113 (1973)), that a woman's constitutional right to privacy includes her right to abortion.

Since this landmark decision, abortion rates and risks have substantially declined, as have the number of teen and unwanted pregnancies.

Restricting all access to reproductive and women's health services only exacerbates a woman's risk of an unintended pregnancy and fails to accomplish any meaningful overthrow of Roe v. Wade.

In recent years, state policymakers have passed hundreds of restrictions on abortion care under the guise of protecting women's health and safety.

Fights here in Congress have been no different.

In my state of Texas a law that would have cut off access to 75 percent of reproductive healthcare clinics in the state was challenged before the U.S. Supreme Court in 2014 and 2015.

On October 2, 2014, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional a Texas law that required that all reproductive healthcare clinics that provided the full range of services would be required to have a hospital-style surgery center building and staffing requirements.

This requirement meant that only 7 clinics would be allowed to continue to provide a full spectrum of reproductive healthcare to women.

Texas has 268,580 square miles only second in size to the state of California.

The impact of the law in implementation would have ended access to reproductive services for millions of women in my state.

In 2015, the State of Texas once again threatened women's access to reproductive health care when it attempted to shutter all but 10 healthcare providers in the state of Texas.

The Supreme Court once again intervened on the behalf of Texas women to block the move to close clinics in my state.

It seems every month we are faced with a new attack on women's access to reproductive health care, often couched in those same terms.

But we know that's not really the case.

If my colleagues were so concerned about women's health and safety, they would be promoting any one of the number of evidence-based proactive policies that improve women's health and well-being.

Instead, they are attacking Planned Parenthood in a back-handed attempt to ban abortion.

That is their number one priority. This is certainly not about protecting women's health, it's about politics.

Just as the 1988 Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel (or the Blue Ribbon Commission) sought to separate the question of ethics of abortion from the question ethics of using fetal tissue from legal elective abortions for medical research when laying the foundation for the 1993, NIH Health Revitalization Act (which passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support), we must separate the personal views of abortion from the legal issues of federal compliance.

Namely, the NIH Health Revitalization Act prohibits the payment or receipt of money or any other form of valuable consideration for fetal tissue, regardless of whether the program to which the tissue is being provided is funded or not.

A limited exception, and crux of the applicable issue of legality, lies with the provision allowing for reimbursement for actual expenses (e.g. storage, processing, transportation, etc.) of the tissue.

Planned Parenthood repeatedly maintains and supports that their affiliates involved with fetal tissue research comply with this requirement.

In fact, of the 700+ affiliate health care centers across the country, only 4 Planned Parenthood affiliates currently offer tissue donation services and of those 4, only 2 (California and Washington) offer fetal tissue donation services—that's 1 percent of all Planned Parenthood service centers.

The California affiliate receives a modest reimbursement of $60 per tissue specimen and the Washington affiliate receives no reimbursement.

It is worth noting that fetal tissue has been used for decades.

Since the 1920's researchers have used fetal tissue to study and treat various neurological disorders, spinal cord injuries, diabetes, immune deficiencies, cancers and life-threatening blood diseases.

One of the earliest advances with fetal tissue was to use fetal kidney cells to create the first poliovirus vaccines, which are now estimated to save 550,000 lives worldwide every year.

The most widely known application in the field of human fetal tissue transplantation has been the Treatment of Parkinson's disease.

Many of our other common vaccines, such as polio, measles, chicken pox, rubella and shingles, have been developed through the use of fetal tissue or cell lines derived from fetal tissue.

When looking at the 1 percent of health care providers involved in fetal tissue donation and research, and no clear credible proof of illegal activity, it is obvious that attacks on Planned Parenthood are wholly misguided.

Planned Parenthood has one of the most rigorous Medical standards and accreditation processes in the country.

It is the only national provider that has developed a single set of evidence-based Medical Standards and Guidelines that define how health care is provided throughout the country.

Guidelines are developed and updated annually by a group of nationally-renowned experts, physicians, and scientists, including medical experts from Harvard and Columbia.

Planned Parenthood affiliates must submit to accreditation reviews that include 100 indicators (or high level areas of review) and over 600 individual Elements of Performance (or measures for review). Half of these relate to the provision of medical care and patient safety.

Planned Parenthood has strict requirements regarding compliance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations. A specific area of compliance is with mandatory reporting laws and regulations regarding reporting in instances where the welfare of a minor is endangered.

All staff with patient contact are rigorously trained regarding compliance with federal, state and local laws and regulations governing service to minors.

Violations of mandatory reporting regulations are subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

It is no secret that the Center for Medical Progress is an extreme anti-choice organization with a goal of outlawing legal abortion procedures in this country.

To achieve that goal, they have shamelessly targeted Planned Parenthood and the funding that provides healthcare services to millions of women every year.

They continue to use deceptive tactics and secret videos to try and undermine Planned Parenthood.

Just like Live Action, the Center for Medical Progress is not a group that can be taken credibly.

The Center for Medical Progress is simply recreating a history of doctoring and manipulating video intended to create misimpressions about Planned Parenthood.

It is a coordinated effort by anti-choice forces—not only on Planned Parenthood or a woman's right to choose, but on women's health care across the board.

At the same time, national media is reporting about a major coordinated push by anti-choice groups and Members of Congress to defund Planned Parenthood.

This coordinated effort to defund Planned Parenthood is an assault on all progressive health care, service, and advocacy organizations who aim to provide vital care and services to women and men across this country.

The public is standing by Planned Parenthood, which plays a vital role in defending women's health and rights.

Hundreds of thousands have already spoken up, including leading groups and communities such as the growing voice of our millennial generation.

My colleagues should be doing more to connect our youth and women to services that help them reduce their risk of unintended pregnancies and STD's, and improve their overall health through preventative screenings, education and planning, rather than restricting their access to lawfully entitled family planning and private health services.

I urge all Members to vote against the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my colleague on the Rules Committee.

□ 1330

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support of this rule and to provide consideration of H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which would ensure that children who survive an abortion, or an attempted abortion, are given proper medical treatment.

I am a proud cosponsor of this bill to ensure that babies born alive are transported and admitted to a hospital immediately following emergency care. As a Christian and as a father of two, I hold maintaining the sanctity of life as my highest priority.

The House of Representatives voted to pass this legislation in the 114th Congress, but it was met with an unresponsive Senate. I will vote again to support this bill to hold healthcare providers accountable, protect and empower mothers, and help ensure that these innocent children are provided the same medical care that any other newborn would receive. I remain hopeful that this time around we can send this important legislation to the President to be signed into law.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time is left on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as long as the gentlewoman doesn't have any other speakers, I am prepared to close.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say to all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, that this process is lousy. This is yet another closed rule. The bill before us didn't even go through committee. There was not a hearing. There was not a markup. It just miraculously appeared right before an anti-choice rally, and here it is, take it or leave it. That is not the way this place is supposed to be run.

At some point, no matter what your ideology is, no matter what you believe about some of these issues, you have to be for a more open process, a more deliberative process. This diminishes the House of Representatives. This is not what the people, I don't care what the political party or ideology may be, want from their Congress. They want a more open and transparent process.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us, as I said before, is a sound bite. It is going nowhere, but it has been introduced, and we are going to be voting on it purely for political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, this morning, the majority whip announced: ''Upon conclusion of debate on H.R. 195''—that is the CR—''the House will recess until 7 p.m.''

Recess? I mean, recess? With all that is at stake, we are going to recess?

This isn't a time for recess or a political rally.

Shame on Republicans who are delaying action in this House on moving the process forward on a continuing resolution, to try to buy some time to make it better, hopefully, so that it can earn bipartisan support. Shame on them for going to a political rally instead of staying here and doing their job.

This is the time to responsibly fund government. Those of us on the Democratic side have a lot of issues with what the House leadership is ramming through in terms of a CR. We were not part of that discussion. We were not asked what our values are and what we think is important. This is purely a product that the Republicans negotiated with Republicans.

My hope is that we have time to make it better, but when you recess until 7, not to make it better, not to negotiate, but so that Republicans can go to a political rally, shame on you for doing that with all that is at stake.

Our soldiers don't want us to recess. Those who depend on community health centers don't want us to recess. Our veterans don't want us to recess. Yet everybody's perfectly fine on the other side of the aisle with taking a break; no big deal; no rush, nothing, as we get closer and closer to this crisis.

At some point we need responsible leadership in this House, and that begins with a return to regular order, a more open and transparent process, a respect for the views of the minority, and it means prioritizing the business of the American people.

I will say funding the government is more important than a political rally in Pennsylvania.

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

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

I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, my colleague from Massachusetts. There is shameful action underway in this Congress, and that shameful action is the fact that, I will say once again, we are in a situation where our men and women in uniform have not received the appropriations that they need to do the job that we are asking them to do. And the reason they haven't—we have passed an authorization bill through this body; we have passed an appropriations bill through this body, but the Democrats in the Senate are refusing to act. The Democrats in the Senate who hold the key to getting 60 votes in the United States Senate are refusing to act. The reason they are refusing to act, Mr. Speaker, is because they want amnesty for illegal immigrants, and they are holding hostage the extent to which we are able to provide resources to fund our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous amount of urgency on both sides of the aisle. I respect my colleague from Massachusetts and I respect his frustration, but I do not respect, Mr. Speaker, the extent to which he is accusing us of shameful behavior.

We are on this floor today talking about a bill that will protect babies who are born alive after abortions. The shameful behavior is that, on the other side of the aisle, they want to talk politics, they want to talk posturing, they want to talk process. They don't want to talk about babies who are born alive after abortion. I know why they don't want to talk about it, because it is uncomfortable. They would rather ignore that it is actually happening, but we can't ignore it.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation in this body to ensure that we provide protection and care for those who cannot, for the most vulnerable among us. Mr. Speaker, it is a moral obligation to ensure the protection of every baby born alive.

I am proud to be here today on behalf of the rule, Mr. Speaker, and I urge adoption of both the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 4712, so we can continue to do what is right, what is morally required of us, and that is to protect and nurture and make sure we have provided safeguards for the unborn and for those who are born alive after abortion.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 694 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 4. 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. 4820) to extend funding for certain public health programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce. 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4820.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 139) ''An Act 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.''.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 195, FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 696 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 696

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 195) to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-55. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of January 20, 2018.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of January 20, 2018, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. 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, yesterday the Rules Committee met and ordered a rule for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, the Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act of 2018. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriations package in front of us represents the fourth continuing resolution to fund the government for the fiscal year 2018. In bringing up this bill, the House is fulfilling its primary obligation to the American people: to fund the government and keep the government open and operating.

With the package under consideration today, Congress will fund the government through February 16, 2018. We will provide crucial dollars to keep the government functioning, to support our troops and the military, and to ensure we are all working for the American people. We will provide time to negotiate a larger agreement on funding the government for the remainder of the fiscal year, as well as a badly needed immigration reform measure.

In addition to funding the government, this bill also includes several other important provisions. Most notably, it reauthorizes the Children's Health Insurance Program—or CHIP, as it is popularly known—for 6 years. It also implements critical delays in certain taxes imposed by the Affordable Care Act, including a 2-year delay for the medical device tax, a 2-year delay for the so-called Cadillac tax on health insurance plans, and a 1-year delay on the health insurance tax.

As a supporter of repealing and replacing the entire Affordable Care Act, I am gratified to see this delay in imposing these harmful taxes on the American people.

Finally, I am also pleased that this bill provides additional funding for ballistic missile defense, which is of crucial importance when dealing with rogue states like North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, in 2017, Congress actually got a great deal done. The House and the Senate have worked with President Trump to do more to deregulate the economy and free small businesses from harmful regulations than any previous Congress.

The Senate has been productive in overhauling the judicial branch, confirming a new Supreme Court Justice and 12 judges for the courts of appeals. The House and the Senate have approved and passed into law a new National Defense Authorization Act, which will provide new tools to rebuild and strengthen our military in the face of global threats.

We have passed two supplemental appropriations bills to deal with the damage caused by multiple disasters across the country, and I am confident we will pass a third in the days ahead.

Above all, the crown jewel in this first year of the 115th Congress has been the passage of major tax reform legislation, which will boost the economy, reduce the tax burden on workers, support working families, and simplify and modernize our burdensome Tax Code. I am particularly pleased this bill included the repeal of the ObamaCare individual mandate.

The place where Congress has not gotten its job done is in the appropriations process. This is not the fault of the House of Representatives. Under the leadership of Chairman BLACK, the House wrote and passed a budget for FY18—fiscal year '18—in April. Through the efforts of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the other members of the Appropriations Committee, the House wrote and passed all 12 appropriations bills prior to the start of the fiscal year.

However, our friends in the Senate have failed to act. We have been waiting for over 120 days—4 months—for the Senate to either act on our bills or write their own and send us passed appropriations legislation to consider. The Senate has not done so. Given their failure to act, we need yet another additional short-term CR to ensure the government remains open.

□ 1345

It is my hope, in the interim, that the leaders of the two Chambers and the President will be able to come together to determine what our spending top lines will be for the fiscal year 2018. Once that happens, all the interested parties can meet to put together a bipartisan and bicameral full-year spending bill.

If the leadership of both Chambers come to an agreement, I am confident that the appropriators can produce bills to fund the government in fiscal year 2018 and begin the important task of producing a budget for fiscal year 2019.

Let me be crystal clear about the consequences of voting against the underlying legislation:

A vote against the underlying legislation is a vote against reauthorizing the Children's Health Insurance Program.

A vote against the underlying legislation is a vote to tax the health insurance plans of millions of Americans.

A vote against the underlying legislation is a vote to tax the medical devices that millions of Americans rely on.

A vote against the underlying legislation is a vote against badly needed funds to protect America against missile attacks from rogue states like North Korea.

And a vote against the underlying legislation is a vote to shut down the government of the United States.

I hope every Member on both sides of the aisle understands these consequences and votes accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, today's CR accomplishes several important tasks and keeps our government open and operating. But there is still more work to be done. In the words of Winston Churchill: ''Give us the tools, and we will finish the job.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary time.

Mr. Speaker, the Chamber finds itself in much the same position it was in on September 8, December 7, and December 21. Those were the other three continuing resolutions that we passed to try to get through here, but we are rushing again with one of the majority's short-term continuing resolutions with days to spare—actually, tomorrow—one day to spare until the great Government of the United States closes for business.

Now, you might think that would be the most important thing on the minds of the majority and of the United States Government, but it isn't because we are not going to get to vote on this tonight until 7 p.m.—and all the people in the country who are holding their breath to see whether they are going to be laid off, the Federal workers, and all the other things that go with that devastating thing.

Let me remind you that the last time the government had a shutdown, $24 billion was lost to the economy, a lot of it to laid-off workers, and also the fact that large numbers of facilities owned by the government have stores and newspaper stands in them that were also closed.

But, no, we are not in any hurry today. Nobody is concerned about it, and the President of the United States and several Members of the House have gone to a political rally in Pennsylvania. They are trying to save a congressional seat there of a person who was forced to step down. That, obviously, is of more importance to them than whether or not this government continues to function.

That is a tragedy, Mr. Speaker, but that is what we have been putting up with for a long time.

I don't recall a time we have had four continuing resolutions in probably a month and a half, but here we are, and I bet you that we will come back in February and do yet another one.

Now, my colleagues who have gone to Pennsylvania could have gone next week—because we are taking another week off back to the district next week—and not caused this great hubbub today, which is one of the most important days in the life of the Nation as to whether we are going to continue to be the Government of the United States.

It is tragic, isn't it?

I remember I was on the floor the last time it shut down, and at midnight I had said: The government of the United States is now closed. I would

hate to be up here to have to say something like that again.

I don't know what else to call it except incompetence. That certainly comes as close to the definition as I can make.

But this latest proposal that we will not vote on until after 7 p.m.—and I understand that will inconvenience some people, but I do hope that other people will be able to stand the suspense. This is the fourth continuing resolution since the end of the fiscal year in September, and it will run, as I said before, through February 16, where I bet you we do another one.

If past is prologue, we probably will find ourselves back because what we do in this House now is be a standby person while the majority goes from one self-imposed crisis to the next. And much like the proposals before it, this continuing resolution is not the product of bipartisan negotiations. It was written solely by the majority without a single Democratic fingerprint anywhere on the bill.

America, pay heed to that. If this government should shut down, this problem is solely that of the Republican Party. We were not asked for our input when it was written in the back room, but since its public release hours ago, the majority has being asking for our support and saying what a shame it is, what a shame that we who don't even believe in this particular thing are not out there beating the drum for it.

But that is not how it works. The majority cannot craft this bill solely by itself and fail to address the matters that we agree we need to take action on and then criticize us for not supporting this partisan proposal.

We had an idea we would come to this point for some time, and I think everybody will agree with me, certainly on my side, and I suspect on both, that our leader, the minority leader, Nancy Peolsi, certainly made herself clear all the way through as to what it would take to get the votes of the Democrats in the House. But there was no consideration given to that, and yet they are asking us for votes.

This stopgap measure continues to just chip away at the Affordable Care Act—and I know my colleague said he was happy about that—by targeting some key funding mechanisms under the law. I suppose I probably did the rule on at least the vast majority of all the times repeal and replace was the fashion here, and I have always asked every single time: Why does the Republican Party want to take healthcare away from people? I have never gotten an answer to that, but I am totally convinced, after all this time, that that is exactly what they want to do.

Since the majority waived the rules requiring the provisions to be paid for for the healthcare act, it is actually a massive tax cut for the health insurance industry. It comes on the heels of the majority's tax cut for the wealthy and corporations, which represents the largest transfer of wealth from working families to the wealthy that our Nation has ever seen. It is a bill that made tax cuts for corporations permanent.

Now, the continuing resolution before us today includes a temporary reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, which provides healthcare for 9 million of America's children. That was only to be for 6 years. But, as you heard already from a previous speaker this morning, had it been made permanent, it would save over $6 billion. I fail to understand the economic benefits of what they are doing here.

Mr. Speaker, why is the majority giving permanent tax cuts to corporations but it won't even give permanency to children in need of healthcare? The majority believes that a temporary reprieve on CHIP will force us to vote for this misguided plan. But what about the community health centers? What about improving healthcare for veterans?

The continuing resolution turns a blind eye to victims in desperate need of help in the wake of some of the worst hurricanes, mudslides, and wildfires our Nation has ever experienced and to 700,000 DREAMers who remain at risk of being deported following President Trump's decision to end DACA.

Remember what DACA was about. We asked young people who had been brought to the United States by their parents at a very young age to come out and to register and say that they were undocumented and that we would protect them as a way to citizenship. But instead, that was taken away from them, and they face deportation and are being deported daily—and it is an emergency.

But it also fails to take any action, this particular CR does, on bipartisan priorities like the pension crisis, veterans healthcare, and, as I said, the community health centers.

What has the majority prioritized instead of crafting a long-term spending bill that deals with these urgent issues? Ideological crusades like undermining financial reform laws and attacking women's health.

We had a wonderful debate just before this bill came on the floor of a thing called Born-Alive. We passed a bill I think unanimously, and I think it was done by voice vote, in 2002, that any infant born in an abortion setting would be given every care in the world, and, in fact, we didn't even need that bill. That is a given.

At the same time, though, that we are debating that on the floor today, that is to do every medical thing possible, the administration announced that, if a provider—a nurse, a doctor, or anybody in a medical setting, and they don't have to give any reason for this—if they personally or for some other reason, morality reason, decide they do not want to treat a patient before them, they don't have to.

Think about that a minute. Well, you know what I am trying to say here. It is more than ironic. It is stupid. But we sort of get used to that.

A separate bill on the floor today, H.R. 2954, would weaken the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, a thing hated by this Congress, their ability to respond to the problematic trends in the mortgage market. So here we go again. The CFPB has already saved over $12 billion for consumers.

Another measure that will be considered this week, H.R. 4712—that was the one I mentioned a minute ago—tries to shame and scare doctors out of providing constitutionally protected abortion services. The bill this morning gives doctors and medical professionals up to 5 years in prison just for practicing medicine to the best of their ability.

And all the while, the majority has been ignoring the elephant in the room and we march toward another government shutdown, and the American people and the world are once again forced to wonder whether the greatest superpower on this planet can keep the lights on. Surely, this is no way to run the Government of the United States.

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 refers to the drama of the moment. Frankly, there wouldn't be any drama if Democrats would simply vote to keep the government open while good faith negotiations are going on on the very topics they are most concerned about.

They are concerned about the immigration issue; there is a negotiation under way. They are concerned about the appropriate balance between military and nonmilitary spending in the budget; there is a negotiation that is under way.

Now, I suspect this effort to threaten a government shutdown in order to achieve policy aims that are unrelated to the funding and operation of the government will not succeed in this House. Here, we have a simple majority. But to my friend's point, and to be fair, that is not the case in the United States Senate. There, Democratic votes will be needed to keep the government open.

Now, this House's responsibility is to do everything we can to keep the government functioning. In addition to that, there are important policy objectives in here that my friends, I think, either agree with or have even been demanding.

The reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program is something both sides agree on. Actually, the 6-year extension is a year beyond what the Democrats asked for when the legislation was originally considered last fall. That is something I know they agree with, and I would hope they would vote for it.

A couple of the unattractive parts of the Affordable Care Act, which even

my opponents who supported it en masse agree with:

It is not very smart to tax the health insurance plans of American workers. We have got a delay of that for 2 years.

They also agree it is not wise to tax medical devices. Again, we have a measure in here that would delay that for 2 years.

They also, I know, believe that we ought to protect the American people against missile attacks from rogue states. There is a request from the Pentagon in here, again, that is fully funded.

□ 1400

There is absolutely nothing in this bill that my friends on the other side object to. There are many things that they support. Now, they are perfectly free to say, well, I would like this, and this, and this, and this added. But there is nothing in here to vote against.

If you want to raise the other issues, I suspect we can work out an agreement. And I suspect those issues are being negotiated, literally, right now in budget discussions and budget talks. So that is the appropriate place to deal with them. But, again, there is no reason to shut down the government or threaten a shutdown unless you are trying to force some unrelated policy objective.

In this case, the immigration issue that my friend refers to, actually things extend into March. There are talks underway there. I don't see how shutting down the government moves us toward that solution.

The same thing is true with the other functions of government. So I would say we have a very reasonable prospect or proposal on the table here. I suspect that we will achieve the majority in this Chamber. Then we will go to the United States Senate, and we will see whether Democrats there really do want to shut down the government, as opposed to pass a number of items that they agree with: keep the government running and keep negotiations going.

That is the responsible thing to do. That is what I think this House will do. That is what I hope Members on both sides of the aisle choose to do, both when they vote here and later when they take this matter up for consideration in the United States Senate.

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

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

For months, the majority has been holding the healthcare of 9 million children and more than 9 million individuals, including seniors, pregnant women, and veterans, hostage while they pass the tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires.

Well, the time is up, and with each day we fail to act, our constituents face uncertain futures. This is wrong. Mr. Speaker, even President Trump agrees we need to act on CHIP. Just this morning, he tweeted: ''CHIP should be part of a long-term solution, not a 30-day or a short-term extension.''

Well, here is our chance to stop playing politics, except we can't do it until 7 o'clock this evening because the President and so many Members of the House are in Pennsylvania at a political rally. I guess this wasn't as important as we thought it was.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative MCEACHIN's bill, H.R. 4820, the Advancing Seniors and Kids Act. This bill would restore certainty and stability to so many of our most vulnerable citizens by responsibly addressing critical healthcare priorities.

It permanently reauthorizes CHIP, saving us $6 billion. It reauthorizes the community health centers for 2 years and includes other vital healthcare programs that provide relief to pregnant women, seniors, and so many more.

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 (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant minority leader, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House. The responsibility to govern rests squarely on their shoulders. Democrats stand ready to keep government open, but neither Speaker RYAN nor Leader MCCONNELL seem interested in finding bipartisan solutions. Maybe they are adhering to President Trump's admonition that we need a ''good government shutdown.''

House Democrats wholeheartedly disagree. We ought to work together in a bipartisan way to help our veterans, to fight the opioid epidemic, to protect millions of workers' pensions, and to help the DREAMers. Today's CR is the fourth kick of the can. Once again, Republicans are engaging in legislative sleight of hand, shamefully using low-income children as political pawns. The Children's Health Insurance Program provides health insurance for 9 million low-income children. Every Democratic Member of this body supports it.

Republicans allowed it to expire more than 4 months ago and have refused to bring it up on its own until they can get something in return. That is wrong. What good is health insurance if you have nowhere to go when your child is sick? Republicans leave community health centers and disproportionate share hospitals out of their temporary authorization.

Mr. Speaker, we could save $6 billion if we permanently authorize CHIP. We should fund community health centers and protect disproportionate share hospitals for 2 years. We should permanently repeal the cap on therapy services for seniors in Medicare. We should fund the highly successful home visiting program for 5 years.

And we could do all of this by passing Representative Donald McEachin's Advancing Seniors and Kids Act. I urge my Republican colleagues to stop playing games with the children's health. Reject this grotesque political calculation, and let's work in a bipartisan way to keep government open.

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

Mr. Speaker, let's be crystal clear on something. The House of Representatives never held up CHIP. It actually passed it in October. We are still waiting for Democrats in the Senate to work with Republicans in the Senate and send us something back. In the meantime, in this bill, my friend said they want to reauthorize CHIP. We reauthorized it for 6 years. There is nothing in it they object to. They believe in the program. I believe in the program. It has had bipartisan support.

When we passed it, it got almost every Republican vote, a couple of dozen Democratic votes. We actually made the bill better in the process, so if you want to fix CHIP, you just simply need to vote for this bill.

And my friends, frankly, we wouldn't be racing Members back here, or the President of the United States, if my friends weren't threatening to block vote against funding the government while negotiations are underway. What advantage do you have in shutting down the government of the United States, which is precisely what my friends are threatening to do? I think they will not succeed here but actually have the ability to do it in the United States Senate, should they choose to do it under the rules of that body.

While negotiations are going on, if you think shutting down the government is a good idea, I beg to differ. If you are using it as a negotiating tactic, then you ought to be ashamed, because that is no way to treat the American people.

We are operating in good faith. There is not an item in this bill that offends any Democrat. Nobody I know is against CHIP. We just heard that. Nobody I know is against delaying the Cadillac tax or the medical device tax in ObamaCare—two parts of that bill that even my friends who supported it tend to disagree with. I know my friends are not opposed to providing ballistic missile defense for the United States of America. I know my friends surely don't want to handicap the American military at a dangerous time by a government shutdown. There is nothing in here that could possibly be offensive to them.

And there are negotiations underway on the very items they are most concerned about: immigration and the appropriate balance in funding level. Shutting down the government while those negotiations are underway isn't going to help us get DACA reform, isn't going to help us actually get a budget that we can operate on. It will actually just simply switch attention away from those and create a crisis, which I assume my friends think will work, somehow, to their political benefit.

I don't think that is true, and I speak from some experience here. I argued against it, but I watched my own side do something like this when it came to defunding ObamaCare. It was not successful. It was not the appropriate way to proceed, and there was a pretty harsh verdict by the American people.

I suggest my friends are running the same risk today. Now, they have every right to do this. I never question any Member's right to vote how they think is appropriate, but, in this case, in this body, I think we have the votes to make sure that they don't shut down the government as they have threatened to do.

In the United States Senate, that is going to be up to them. Frankly, if Democratic Senators want to shut down the government to achieve some policy objective, that is their choice. But I think it will be crystal clear at the end of the day who actually closed down the government for some unrelated policy aim that was actually under negotiation at the time.

So I would, again, just urge my friends to benefit from our experience and sit down and keep negotiating while we keep the government open. I think if we do that, we will arrive at a constructive solution for the American people. I think if we don't, it is going to be a political crisis that was unprovoked and unnecessary.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Oklahoma—and he is a good friend. We have seen each other often in the Rules Committee—protests too much. This is not a bill, and the American people should know that it is not a bill. It is an affirmation of the inability of Republicans to govern.

Republicans have the Presidency, the Senate, and the House. A few months ago, their President indicated that we need a good, beautiful government shutdown. Those are not my words. Those are the words of the President of the United States. This is not an appropriations bill. This is a stopgap emergency method in order to save ourselves from collapse. That is the Republican's responsibility.

Democrats, so many months ago, passed a budget, as a member of the Budget Committee, a budget that respected the needs of all Americans, including the United States Department of Defense. It provided funding for ordinary men and women who put on the uniform, some of them on food stamps. It provided for veterans health. It provided for the children's health insurance. It provided for infrastructure, and it provided for ensuring that Americans could have good healthcare. That was the Democrat's budget.

The Republican budget was a $2.4 trillion, and counting, cut to the needs of the American people. It threatened Medicaid and Medicare, quite contrary to Democrats. Now, we find ourselves in the midst of those in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who barely got lights or power during the holiday season or thereafter. It is dealing with Texans who have no power in their homes, living in shells. They have no heat. They are waiting on disaster supplemental relief that is not coming.

And, of course, what about CHIP? I represent the Texas Children's Hospital with my colleagues. My district surrounds that area. I have been to that hospital. I have seen what the Children's Health Insurance Program means to saving lives. What does that mean? Six years, that is nebulous. What about permanent?

What about passing Mr. MCEACHIN's bill on working with seniors and children? That is serious. And I don't know what my friends heard, but earlier this morning, I heard the President say: Snatch CHIP out of it. They want to be in negotiation. I just want to be mean.

And you know how you are being mean? You are not here seriously dealing with this. You are going off on a rally so that you can support the man that is running in the Pennsylvania suburbs who loves the President. That is not democracy. Whoever is running, let them run.

Right now, in here, we need some help and we need to work on these issues for the 700,000 near-Americans. They are DREAMers, but they serve in the military. They are in medical school. They are Ph.D.s. They are teachers, and we have them suffering. Some of them have committed suicide because of the ugliness of this body controlled by Republicans in the House and the Senate.

Finally, let me say that any President who can call something an s---hole is not a serious negotiator.

I believe it is the Republicans' responsibility to put a bill on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Rule, which makes in order legislation extending the Continuing Resolution now in effect for another month, or until February 16, 2018.

This resolution is yet another short-term Continuing Resolution (CR) to extend government funding for a few weeks, this time until February 16th.

This is the fourth time House Republicans have chosen to kick the can down the road rather than work with Democrats to come to a necessary bipartisan agreement to lift the Budget Control Act (BCA) spending caps, giving appropriators the direction they need for full-year funding bills.

The reason given for passing each of the prior Continuing Resolutions was that the extra time was needed to reach a comprehensive agreement to fund government operations in a fair and balanced way.

Yet, even with the extra time, House Republicans made no progress during any of the previous extensions.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support a rule that does not make in order legislation that provides full funding for disaster recovery, extends additional health access for veterans, provides funding to combat the opioid epidemic, and protects pensions.

Most important, it is outrageous that House Republicans would bring to the floor and request support for a fourth CR extension that does not address and resolve the crisis the Republican Administration has inflicted on 800,0oo Dreamers and their families, including 124,000 Dreamers in my home state of Texas.

Instead of acting responsibly to address these issues and fund the government for the remainder of the fiscal year, House Republicans continue wasting time.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us includes a six year reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), which provides health coverage to nine million children, and which Republicans allowed to lapse on September 30, 2017.

In contrast, making CHIP permanent would not only provide long-term stability for families, providers, and states, it would save $6 billion according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Republicans are only just now getting around to reauthorizing the program because they wasted months on efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and enact unpaid for tax cuts for the wealthy.

This resolution includes additional tax cuts totaling over $26 billion, including a two year delay of the medical device and Cadillac taxes, and a one year delay of the health insurance tax.

At the same time, the resolution fails to address numerous other expired and expiring health priorities, from funding for community health centers to waiving caps on therapy services for seniors on Medicare, to preventing cuts to safety net hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, despite controlling the House, Senate, and the White House, Republicans have not funded the government for the entire year, even though we are already four months into the fiscal year.

Because Republicans refuse to work with Democrats and compromise on how to provide relief from the BCA's sequester level spending caps, they are lurching from CR to CR—degrading the readiness of our military and preventing government agencies from properly serving the American people.

This is not a responsible way to govern.

Therefore, I cannot support the Rule or the underlying bill.

Instead, Republicans need to work across the aisle with Democrats and get our work done—including upholding the long-standing precedent of agreeing to parity when providing relief from sequester caps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Texas has expired. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized. The gentlewoman from Texas is not recognized.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. * * *

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

Just to be clear with my good friend from Texas, Democrats didn't pass a budget. They proposed a budget. That is fair enough, but they never passed a budget in this House. There was a budget that was passed by the Republican majority. It is interesting, that budget actually came into balance within 10 years. Our friends on the other side never presented a budget that came into balance from any of their various groups.

Frankly, the last administration never presented a budget that ever came into balance. So it is hard to talk about a budget that never comes into balance as if it is a responsible document. It is clearly not.

In terms of my friend's concern about CHIP, it is an appropriate concern. The answer is right in front of her. Simply vote for this bill. You got a 6-year authorization that was longer than my friends originally asked for in the negotiations that were last fall.

□ 1415

This House has actually, again, met all of its obligations. My friends' counterparts in the other body, frankly, have used their votes under the rules of that body to sabotage any appropriations process whatsoever. It requires 60 votes in the United States Senate. Unfortunately, we only have 51. So if Democrats won't sit down and negotiate, nothing much gets done over there. That is why we are here today. Frankly, we are here to make sure the government doesn't shut down.

Now, again, my friends have every right to vote to shut down the government. If they vote ''no'' on this measure, that is exactly what they are doing. They are voting to shut down the government. They are voting not to reauthorize CHIP. They are voting to tax the American people by putting taxes on their healthcare plans and putting taxes on medical devices. They are missing the opportunity to help us with missile defense in a very dangerous era. And they are throwing away the time while negotiations on the topics they are concerned about are underway—negotiations on the budget and negotiations on DACA.

So why my friends want to do this at this particular point is beyond me. But I would suggest it is not likely to work. It is likely to backfire. If we end up in a government shutdown—something I would very much advise against—I think my friends, all of whom will have voted to shut down the government, will bear the responsibility. I think the American people will understand.

Now, again, I don't think my friends will succeed in this House, but they may well in the upper Chamber because, up there, they do have the votes under the rules of that body to shut down the government. I would urge them not to do that and to keep the government operational, to take these victories—and they are victories where we agree—and keep negotiating on the issues that most concern us. I think that is the appropriate way to proceed, and I would urge my friends to adopt that course.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and, once again, for her tremendous leadership on so many issues as our ranking member.

Now, I serve as a member of the Appropriations and the Budget Committees, and I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the continuing resolution.

I just want to make one comment before I start my statement with regard to what was just said about Democrats shutting down the government.

First of all, there is no way that Democrats are voting to shut down the government, given the fact that the Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House. The numbers just aren't there for Democrats to do this. So I hope that people on the other side—Republicans and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—will be honest about that because there is no way, given the numbers and given the composition of the House, the Senate, and the White House, that Democrats can do that.

This bill kicks the can down the road for the fourth time, mind you, since October.

Republicans control, again, as I said, the three bodies: the House, the Senate, White House. The least they could do is honor the basic responsibility of being in the majority, and that is to keep the government open.

Sadly, they continue to drive this country to the brink of one avoidable, self-inflicted crisis after another.

This short-term resolution ignores—ignores—urgent bipartisan priorities that Democrats have been pushing for months with Republicans, the most urgent of which is passing a clean Dream Act. DACA recipients are American in every way except on paper, and right now, their lives are hanging in the balance. Every day Congress fails to take action, 122 DACA recipients lose their protections. It is time to put politics aside and pass a clean Dream Act immediately.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution is really irresponsible and it is morally bankrupt. It fails to honor the temporary protected status for immigrants. It fails to raise budget caps equally for defense and nondefense spending. It fails to fund community health centers. It neglects to provide desperately needed funding for hurricane- and wildfire-impacted communities, the opioid epidemic, community health centers, and our veterans.

This bill underscores the majority's complete lack of regard for everyday Americans and struggling families.

Continuing resolutions leave the American people out on a limb with no confidence, mind you, in their Federal Government. This resolution makes it clear that is just what Republicans want to do. The American people sent us to Congress to govern in their best interest. Unfortunately, this CR is just the opposite. It is completely irresponsible.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, this CR does nothing—nothing—to help create jobs, better wages, and ultimately a better future for our children and our families.

It is really clear to me that the delay on this bill is because some House Republicans are in Pennsylvania. I was shocked when I learned this. They are in Pennsylvania with the President at a political rally.

What is that about?

They should be here in Washington, D.C., to do their job. Shame on them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this rule and the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a press release from—my friends may have missed this—the Children's Hospital Association.

[Press Release, Jan. 18, 2018]

CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS TO CONGRESS: KIDS CAN'T WAIT, FUND CHIP NOW

WASHINGTON, DC.— The Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) is vital to millions of children and families. These families have been living with uncertainty since funding for CHIP expired at the end of September. States are exhausting all available program funds and have announced plans to freeze enrollment and, in some cases, end their programs altogether. Kids can't wait any longer.

Congress has a chance to pass a long-term extension of CHIP that will provide security for millions of kids. The continuing resolution being considered by Congress includes a six-year extension of CHIP. Children's hospitals support a long-term extension of CHIP and urge Congress to take this opportunity to pass CHIP this week. The time is now to extend funding for this lifeline millions of children and their families count on every day.

About the Children's Hospital Association—the Children's Hospital Association is the national voice of more than 220 children's hospitals, advancing child health through innovation in the quality, cost and delivery of care.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, the Children's Hospital Association has actually urged that this bill be adopted. They have urged that we, for 6 years, ensure the funding. They would like my friends—who I know believe in the program—to actually vote for the measure in front of them.

Now, we have heard a number of things about kicking the can down the road. I confess, keeping the government open while negotiations are in progress is something we are trying to do.

But I also point out this is not simply a normal CR. It settles the Children's Health Insurance Program for the next 6 years and appropriately funds it. It delays tax increases, which my friends also oppose, although they voted for them in ObamaCare on people's health insurance programs and on medical devices. It provides badly needed dollars for missile defense in an era of crisis with an irresponsible state.

It doesn't have anything in it that offends my friends in any way. There is nothing in this bill they are against. If they are, I would like to know.

Is it CHIP that my friends are against? Is it delaying the Cadillac tax that my friends are against? Is it, frankly, delaying the medical device tax increase that my friends are against? Is it putting more money in ballistic missile defense that my friends are against? Or is it just continuing the government's operations that my friends are against while negotiations are underway?

I am not sure which one my friends are for, but it suggests to me if there is nothing in here they are against, then they ought to be voting for the bill.

Finally, to my friend's point—and there is more to this than their comments would suggest—to suggest that we simply can control the universe around here isn't true. We don't write the Senate rules. I wish we did. They would probably look a lot different and we probably would have less of a problem. But my friends have not been able to shut down the government here, although they tried to in December. I don't think they will be able to shut down the government, although they will try to again today.

But in the United States Senate, the Democrats will decide whether or not the government continues to operate; whether or not CHIP is reauthorized for 6 years, as the Children's Hospital Association urges; whether or not millions of American families are spared from a tax increase simply because they fought and worked for a decent insurance plan; whether or not millions of Americans who depend on medical devices for their survival have to pay more for them; and whether or not we have a higher level of certainty that we can defend ourselves against an unprovoked and dangerous attack that might occur at any moment.

That will be a decision for Democrats in the Senate to make as long as we vote here to move this legislation forward. I think we will, and I would invite my friends to join us in that.

There is nothing in here that offends my friends. There are many things that my friends like, and there are negotiations underway on the things that are my friends' concerns.

I would suspect that is the course that we ought to take, and I would urge my friends to reconsider and adopt that course.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if he is prepared to close? I have no further speakers.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly prepared to close whenever my good friend is.

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

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Mr. COLE, seems almost to be desperate to have us vote for this continuing resolution, which says to me that the majority doesn't have enough votes to pass it. Somehow by saying that because the Democrats will not support this farce, then we are going to be responsible for it. But, frankly, my good friends are three for three on government shutdowns just since I have been a Member of Congress. Nobody is going to believe that, with all the excess numbers of votes here—I think you have 23 more Members have than we have got—we are at fault.

But, anyway, let's get to the business here.

Instead of treating this like the serious issue that it is, the President is treating it like another reality show. He has suggested that Democrats would certainly be blamed for the majority's inability to keep the government running. But he is wrong about that, too. Just this week, a poll from Hart Research Associates found that the public would blame the majority by a double-digit margin. That gap grows wider when you look specifically at independent Americans.

History shows this to be true. When the majority shut down the government over the Affordable Care Act in 2013, a majority of the public placed the blame on them, not President Obama. We saw similar results when former Speaker Gingrich engineered shutdowns in both 1995 and 1996 because he thought the seat given to him on Air Force One did not fit his stature. The American people then blamed the Republican congressional majority, not President Bill Clinton. That is because facts matter, and the fact here is that the majority chose a partisan approach that threatens our ability to keep the government functioning.

But this discussion should not be centered on blame. It is about whether the Republican majority can even govern. Holding the White House, the Senate, and the House comes with great responsibilities, and, obviously, the most basic one—and we all understand this—to start with is keeping the Government of the United States running.

Yet we are confronted all the time with this problem: Are we going to be able to pay the bills and keep things going?

That is so humiliating for America. There is no other word for it.

But this majority, as pointed out before, just lurches from crisis to crisis to crisis, and they lurch around from one deadline to the next without any plan. All the time, all you need to do is ask to let us work together, let Democrats in on your backroom plans. We never get to see that. We are never consulted and never a part of any plan.

Let me remind everyone watching that the last Republican shutdown in 2013 cost the economy an estimated $24 billion. Federal loans to small businesses, homeowners, and families were halted, and numbers of great Federal employees were furloughed. Federal permitting was stopped. Hundreds of patients at the National Institutes of Health were unable to enroll in possible lifesaving clinical trials. Federal scientific research was also put on hold. We had five Nobel Prize-winning scientists working for the Federal Government at that time, and four of them were furloughed.

The majority apparently thinks it has the votes to go it alone on this bill, but I don't think so anymore. We thought so when I wrote this. But they think we are going to prevent a repeat of all that carnage. It is a shame that they squandered a chance to work with us to craft a bipartisan bill. Frankly, I think it is tragedy, and I think it is no way to run the government.

Without question, we could have kept the government running while addressing the priorities that Members of both parties agree on, like we used to.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to, as always, thank my good friend. We disagree on this, but there is nobody that I enjoy serving with on the Rules Committee more than my good friend, the ranking member. She is a wise and able legislator.

There are a couple of things she said I am going to agree with. She did say that facts matter. I actually agree with that. Facts do matter here, and the fact of the matter is anyone who votes ''no'' on this resolution is voting to shut down the government. Anyone—Republican or Democrat—who votes ''no'' has said: I am not willing to keep the government open while negotiations are underway.

Anyone who votes ''no'' is voting against a 6-year extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program that we all agree on to say is critical. Anyone who votes ''no'' is absolutely guaranteed a tax increase or will be voting for a tax increase on American workers who happen to have a fairly decent insurance program. Anybody who votes ''no'' is going to raise taxes on Americans who are ill enough to require medical devices.

Anyone who votes ''no'' is going to make sure we don't have the resources we need to protect this country in a time of international crisis against a potential rogue missile attack.

□ 1430

Anyone who votes ''no,'' to begin where I started, is voting to shut down

the government. It is that simple. My friends did that in December because they thought, ''Well, they can't do it without us,'' but we did. I suspect we will be able to do that again. But I regret that anyone would vote ''no'' on those kinds of votes because I think they will come back to haunt them.

My friend also—and I think this may actually be the key to the issue—quoted polling data that said the Republicans are going to get the blame anyway. That may be true. I don't doubt the accuracy of my friend's numbers, but I suspect that, once they watch the process, the American people are pretty smart and they will understand a ''no'' vote is a vote to shut down the government.

Now, if my friends are gambling that Republicans will get the blame for this because they have done this in the past, I think they are running a terrible risk with their own credibility.

In this body, we will succeed. I don't serve in the United States Senate, never served in the United States Senate, never worked for anybody who served in the Senate. They have rules that will allow the Democrats to shut down the government if they choose to do it. I don't think they will. But if they do, I think they will regret it. Certainly, many on my side regret some of the decisions they made in the last crisis of this kind.

I hope we do the responsible thing in this body and count on cooler heads in the United States Senate to do the same thing.

I also would point out that in this bill that my friends are going to vote ''no'' on—probably in overwhelming numbers, I am sad to say—there is nothing in it they disagree with. They don't disagree with the CHIP reauthorization. They don't disagree with delaying taxes in the Affordable Care Act. They don't disagree with providing additional missile defense.

They tell us they want to keep the government operating, particularly when there are negotiations underway on the matters that actually concern them. That strikes me as incredibly disingenuous, shortsighted, or both.

So I urge my friends: Do what you must on the rule. The rule is the rule. That is always a partisan exercise, and I always respect my friends for voting ''no'' on a rule. But the underlying legislation is real: whether or not the government operates; whether or not we take care of these knotty problems where we happen to agree; whether or not we actually put the well-being of the country, in terms of its defense, above the media partisan interests. Those things are all areas that shouldn't be tough votes.

So I would hope my friends reconsider, come down and vote to keep the government running instead of shutting it down, come down and vote to keep taxes from being imposed on hard-working families through their health insurance plan or medical devices, come down and vote to make sure we have the strongest possible defense against any possible attack on our country, and come down and vote to keep the government open while negotiations are underway. I think the failure to do that is one that my friends will look back on with deep regret in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I encourage all Members to support the rule. Today's bill represents the next step toward fulfilling our primary obligation as Members of Congress: to fund the government. Although not perfect, the bill before us today will fund our government and keep it open and operating through February 16, 2018.

We will also reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program for 6 years and achieve a delay in several harmful Obama taxes. While doing so, we bolster the defense of our country at a dangerous time.

While I look forward to completing our work and passing a bipartisan, bicameral full-year omnibus spending bill, for now, this legislation will keep the government open and operating and give us time to continue working toward a bipartisan agreement for the American people.

I applaud my colleagues for their work.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 696 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 4. 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. 4820) to extend funding for certain public health programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce. 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4820.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 694; and

Adoption of House Resolution 694, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 191, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
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)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
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
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
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
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—191

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

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta
Cummings
Kelly (PA)
Kind
Meehan
Noem
Rothfus
Scalise
Shuster
Thompson (PA)

□ 1458

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—226

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
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)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
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
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
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
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—194

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar

Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
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
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta
Cummings
Kelly (PA)
Kind
Meehan
Noem
Rothfus
Scalise
Shuster
Thompson (PA)

□ 1506

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4712, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 22, 2018, THROUGH JANUARY 26, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 694) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4712) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, and providing for proceedings during the period from January 22, 2018, through January 26, 2018, 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 229, nays 190, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
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)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
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
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
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
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—190

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

NOT VOTING—11

Barletta
Beyer
Cummings
Kelly (PA)
Kind
Meehan
Noem
Rothfus
Scalise
Shuster
Thompson (PA)

□ 1514

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 29.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—228

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
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
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)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Nunes
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.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—189

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

NOT VOTING—13

Barletta
Bonamici
Cummings
Gosar
Kelly (PA)
Kind
Meehan
Noem
Norman
Rothfus
Scalise
Shuster
Thompson (PA)

□ 1522

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall votes 27 through 30 because I was traveling to Pennsylvania with President Trump. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 27, "Yea" on rollcall No. 28, "Yea" on rollcall No. 29, and "Yea" on rollcall No. 30.

HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 693, I call up the bill (H.R. 2954) to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 693, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 115–518, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2954

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act".

SEC. 2. DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS SUBJECT TO MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2803) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (i) as paragraph (3) and adjusting the margins accordingly; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following:

"(i) EXEMPTIONS.—

"(1) CLOSED-END MORTGAGE LOANS.—With respect to a depository institution, the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to closed-end mortgage loans if the depository institution originated less than 500 closed-end mortgage loans in each of the 2 preceding calendar years.

"(2) OPEN-END LINES OF CREDIT.—With respect to a depository institution, the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to open-end lines of credit if the depository institution originated less than 500 open-end lines of credit in each of the 2 preceding calendar years.".

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 304(i)(3) of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, as so redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking "section 303(2)(A)" and inserting "section 303(3)(A)".

SEC. 3. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION RESERVE FUND.

Notwithstanding section 4(i)(2)(B)(i) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d(i)(2)(B)(i)), the amount deposited in the Securities and Exchange Commission Reserve Fund for fiscal year 2018 may not exceed $48,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today in support of H.R. 2954, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act.

H.R. 2954, which was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), a very hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee, is a very important piece of legislation

that will provide much-needed regulatory relief for our community banks and credit unions from onerous CFPB regulations that are impeding their ability to make home loans to our constituents.

On January 1 of this year, draconian changes went into effect related to the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act known as HMDA. These changes, which were mandated by Dodd-Frank and blindly implemented by the CFPB, radically expanded the information that lenders are required to collect, record, and report about mortgage applications and loans. But like many things the CFPB is involved in, the rule went far, far beyond what was originally intended by Congress, and effects have far-reaching and negative consequences on community financial institutions and home buyers.

To be more specific, the CFPB's updated HMDA rule now requires financial institutions to collect 48—48—unique, different data fields on each mortgage loan they make. This is more than double—double—the number, Mr. Speaker, of data fields lenders were required to collect before the rule went into effect.

Now, as if adding 25—two dozen—more data fields weren't enough, the CFPB rule also modified 20 of the 23 existing fields in this constant, constant changing of the regulatory scheme to fit the narrative of regulators rather than focus on the cost and benefits to our constituents of existing statutes.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, again, the constant changing of this regulatory scheme, the increased complexity and cost, we do not fully appreciate the impact on our community financial institutions, and we do not fully appreciate how this is impeding the success and growth of our community financial institutions in the communities we represent.

You don't have to take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. A community banker in Kansas has said that: ''As crazy as it seems, our current HMDA process includes four people verifying HMDA data on each loan.''

Mr. Speaker, that was before the changes we are discussing today.

According to that same community banker, who is trying to fund homes in his local community, doubling the number of data fields, as required in the CFPB's HMDA rule, ''will almost be overwhelming for a bank such as ours.''

As a community banker from Nebraska has stated: ''All the new mortgage lending rules have made it almost impossible to provide timely service to our local customers.''

So home buyers are feeling this effect, Mr. Speaker. As one community banker from Ohio explained, he was working with a woman who recently went through the tragedy of divorce. She was trying to refinance her home in order to make ends meet. But after filing mountains and mountains of paperwork and wading through all the different forms, she looked up at the banker and said: ''Jim, just tell me it will be okay.''

As Jim put it: ''At that point, I realized just how overwhelming all the forms and disclosures were to a customer.''

Sadly, we all have—the lawmakers, the regulators, and the bankers—forgotten the most important item in this entire process: the customer.

This community banker is right, Mr. Speaker. Our local financial institutions, our community banks, our smallest financial institutions especially, they have to spend less time in resources meeting Washington's complex, burdensome, onerous paperwork requirements. Instead, we need to give them more freedom to do what they do best, and that is to help people in their communities get into homes they can actually afford to keep.

But doubling—doubling—HMDA data requirements needlessly—needlessly—makes home buying more expensive, more confusing, and more difficult for the very people that we should be trying to help.

Home buyers like April from Kentucky wrote that the process to get a home: ''Is almost impossible and extremely frustrating.''

Or a home buyer from Michigan by the name of Rob, who explained: ''The very people this was supposed to be helpful to, lower income working Americans, have been the parties most devastated by the overreach.''

And that is exactly what this is, Mr. Speaker, overreach. And it is not only these individuals, but even charities—great charities like Habitat for Humanity, who said: ''Thanks to the CFPB's burdensome regulations and rules, charities such as Habitat that provide these loans have found it more difficult to do their important work.''

H.R. 2954, from the gentleman from Minnesota, simply addresses the fact that in order to make home loans, small financial institutions should not and cannot afford to keep pace with the massive laws that disregard their businesses, their business models, and create an uneven playing field.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason and for the others I have stated, I urge all colleagues to help struggling would-be home buyers in our districts and to support H.R. 2954.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2954, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act, which would undermine efforts to monitor trends in mortgage lending, combat discriminatory and predatory lending, and ensure that consumers who reside in low- and moderate-income communities have fair access to mortgage credit.

In 1975, Congress enacted the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, also known as HMDA, in response to concerns that despite their responsibility to provide adequate home financing to qualified applicants on reasonable terms and conditions, some lenders' failure to do so had contributed to a decline in housing conditions in communities of color.

HMDA data provide the only comprehensive picture of the rates at which American consumers' requests for mortgages are approved and denied. As a result, it has many important uses.

HMDA data provide information on mortgage lending patterns and trends that allow regulators, lenders, researchers, and the public to better understand and address redlining concerns by identifying possible discriminatory lending patterns, and monitoring compliance with and enforcement of statutes, like the Community Reinvestment Act; and Federal antidiscrimination laws, like the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and the Fair Housing Act.

Local governments also use HMDA data to determine which financial institutions are meeting the needs of their communities and should receive important benefits funded by the taxpayers of those communities.

For example, in Antioch, California, the local government uses HMDA data when selecting banks for contracts and participation in local programs.

HMDA data are also used by government officials to determine areas of disinvestment that are in need of targeted assistance. Take Flint, Michigan, for example. There, HMDA data has been used to target funds to remediate blight.

Communities also use HMDA data to identify discriminatory lending patterns and enforce antidiscrimination statutes. HMDA data, for example, were used in Chicago to identify discrimination and lending patterns in its neighborhoods, leading to a large discriminatory lending settlement.

It was precisely because of HMDA data that Congress learned during the run-up to the financial crisis that African Americans were routinely steered into predatory subprime loans, even when they qualified for prime mortgages, and they received these loans at higher rates than White borrowers.

Following the financial crisis, Congress updated HMDA when it passed the Dodd-Frank Act, directing the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to close information gaps about mortgage lending patterns and practices that contributed to the 2007–2008 financial crisis, as well as other data that could better identify discrimination.

Accordingly, in 2015, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau finalized a rule that required sufficient information to shed light on predatory practices in the mortgage market, and it considered compliance costs and burdens imposed on institutions that collect, maintain, and report the data. Through this rule, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau added and

implemented additional data fields that must be reported in order to further close information gaps about mortgage lending patterns and practices.

The new data fields include basic loan facts, such as the address of the property, interest rate of the mortgage, and the borrower's credit score.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's rule only excluded truly small lenders; banks that originate fewer than 25 closed-end loans, like mortgages; and 100 open-end lines of credit, like home equity lines, because providing broader relief would negatively affect low- and moderate-income communities.

Specifically, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau wrote: ''The loss of data in communities at closed-end mortgage loan volume thresholds higher than 25 would substantially impede the public's and public officials' ability to understand access to credit in their communities.''

Despite the harm posed to low- and moderate-income communities around the country, H.R. 2954 would permanently raise the threshold for new HMDA data for both mortgage loan-type data and lines of credit to 500 without a good understanding about the real impact of doing so.

At this level, 85 percent or 5,400 depository institutions and 48 percent of nonbanks or 497 institutions would be exempt. That is 6,000 financial institutions that would no longer report important lending data.

By prohibiting these important new data fields from being reported under HMDA, regulators would not be able to fully determine the extent of redlining, discrimination, and other harmful practices. This will make it harder for fair lending violations to be detected, as HMDA data are routinely used by the Department of Justice to identify and remedy discrimination in lending.

These new data fields are essential for shedding light on the kinds of discrimination, like age, that now flies under the radar. It is not surprising that over 170 civil rights, fair housing, consumer and community organizations across the country have come out strongly against this bill. These groups have stated that: ''The updated HMDA data will provide critical information about whether similarly situated borrowers in underserved communities are receiving equitable access to mortgage credit, data that we lacked a decade ago when the crisis hit.''

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the need for Congress to consider tailored and sensible regulatory relief to community financial institutions, but this bill is not that relief.

Financial institutions are already required to collect this data as part of existing mortgage regulations or as part of the mortgage underwriting process.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support H.R. 2954 because it undermines effective fair lending enforcement by reducing HMDA data. This bill will contribute to unequal access to affordable credit for people of color, low- to moderate-income families, and borrowers in rural areas.

History has repeatedly shown us that when financial institutions are merely trusted to operate in good faith, American consumers are left vulnerable to discriminatory and predatory lending, communities are stripped of wealth, and our economy is weakened.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to reject this rollback of a key fair lending tool and to join me in opposing H.R. 2954.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), a very valuable member of our committee and the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, every citizen in our Nation desires the chance to achieve their American Dream. For thousands across this country, their American Dream consists of owning a home or starting their own business.

Some laws have proven helpful in achieving this dream; others have created obstacles by codifying government overreach.

In 1975, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act was enacted. This important law exposed and helped eliminate discriminatory lending practices, particularly against minorities. In short, this law helped more Americans realize their dream of owning a home.

Over the years, however, the disclosures required by the law have expanded away from the original intent and have actually become an obstacle, preventing small, medium, and local lenders from helping aspiring landowners and business entrepreneurs.

In 2015, the Dodd-Frank-created agency, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, demanded from lenders more than double the amount of data originally required under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act.

That double-the-data rule took effect on the 1st of this month. Larger lenders are able to adapt. In fact, most, if not all, continue to be in the home mortgage business today.

But for smaller lenders, for the family-owned bank on Main Street, the double-the-data rule means making fewer mortgages or none at all. This unintended result is something each of us has heard over and over again in our home districts.

Again, these are not the Wells Fargos, the Bank of Americas, or the J.P.Morgans. These are the small guys, the little guys on Main Street Minnesota and Main Streets all across this country.

We all remember the financial crisis of 2008 and the devastation it brought to this Nation. Our economy suffered greatly.

□ 1545

No one wants that again. Unfortunately, Congress reacted by demanding that small banks and credit unions, quite literally, pay for a crisis they didn't cause. In the great State of Minnesota, the ''Land of 10,000 Lakes,'' I consistently hear from small banks and credit unions that want to do what they do best: help Minnesotans achieve the American Dream.

Due to the increased cost of compliance with the CFPB's double-the-data rule—an estimated additional $326 million—many small banks in Minnesota are reconsidering their ability to continue to make mortgages and other covered loans.

In 2014, Minnesota credit unions were on the hook for $7.2 billion in compliance costs. That is before the double-the-data rule. Not only are the additional HMDA compliance burdens ill-suited and unnecessary for these institutions, the CFPB's rule does very little to provide additional protection, all while potentially exposing consumers to potential identity theft or fraud.

This information comes from those on the ground, the ones who are seeing this misguided rule in action. As a direct result of having fewer and fewer small, medium, and local lenders in the home mortgage business or offering capital for their neighbor's small business to get off the ground, the CFPB's rule has put the American Dream out of reach for thousands across the country.

Mr. Speaker, today we have to rightsize government regulation to create more opportunity. We have the opportunity to encourage small- and medium-sized financial institutions in our local communities to keep their doors open, to make mortgages again, to make loans to would-be entrepreneurs, in short, to fund the dreams of their neighbors and friends.

We have an opportunity to expand, not the law, but rather, and instead, the number of Americans who can own a home or start their own business.

I first introduced the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act when I came to Congress in 2015. It is a bill that would keep the original intent of the 1975 law. Nothing will overwrite or exempt any financial institution, big or small, from reporting data related to race and gender. It is a bill that will put a stop to the loss of small- and medium-sized lenders by providing desperately needed regulatory relief for Main Street banks and credit unions.

I am pleased to say it is a bill that has been perfected with the input from both sides of the aisle, present company excluded, and in both Chambers. Our goal today shouldn't be to expand the law. Our goal today should be to expand the number of Americans who want to get one step closer to achieving their American Dream, whether it is owning a home or starting a business.

Mr. Speaker, that is our goal, and today we can take a big step forward in reaching that goal. If my fellow colleagues share this goal, then I urge you to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2954, and pass the

Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota who described his district, he failed to mention that the China-Asia Economic Development Association and the Jewish Community Action group all oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ranking Member WATERS for her steadfast leadership.

While I have great respect for the gentleman from Minnesota, I rise in strong opposition to this bill before us today. I feel so lucky and fortunate to represent Florida's 13th Congressional District which includes my hometown of St. Petersburg, ''The Sunshine City.'' It is a beautiful place to grow up, to visit, to live, to work, and to retire.

It is also a place that still bears some scars of segregation. The Fair Housing Act was signed 50 years ago this spring. Why then are so many neighborhoods still segregated? Why are so many of our constituents still victimized by redlining and unequal access to credit? Fair housing data is a critical tool to right the wrongs of the past, to see how well banks are serving all of our communities.

It helps root out the occasional bad apple and the occasional bad institution. This data is worth the effort. In a perfect world, we wouldn't need laws to protect the vulnerable, or data to enforce those laws. But having fought and won discrimination suits on behalf of the people as Florida's attorney general, I will tell you, this is not a perfect world.

While I share my colleagues' desire to make regulatory compliance less burdensome, let's not make it easier on banks by making it harder for fair housing.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chairman of our Financial Services' Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his hard work on our committee and leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for sponsoring this very important legislation. Banks and credit unions of all sizes are drowning in a sea of paperwork. We hear about it every day from lenders that appear before the Financial Services Committee. The reality is that, because of the regulatory environment, mortgage lending is simply too burdensome for some community banks and credit unions. Lenders have little choice but to limit the products and services made available to customers or, in some cases, exit the mortgage business all together, which some have actually done.

The changes we have seen on the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act requirements are a great example of regulation run amuck. On every loan, lenders must check a lengthy series of boxes. One mistake lands a bank or credit union out of compliance, in hot water with the field examiners, and potentially exposed to litigation.

In committee, I had a matrix. It is almost 300 boxes of things that they have to look at. Then if there is one box that is out of compliance, you could be exposed.

The Obama administration CFPB significantly expanded regulatory requirements associated with HMDA. Financial institutions now have to report a total of 48 different data fields for each individual borrower. In fact, today's HMDA requirements are more than double the statutory requirements established by Congress.

What do we get for all of this box checking? Not a lot, beyond a more burdensome process that, in the best case scenario, slows the borrowing process. These rules and regulations make it more and more difficult for small institutions to absorb costs and results in constricted credit and higher price for consumers' and customers' needs.

Compliance with HMDA requirements is one of the top concerns and frustrations I hear from community banks in Missouri. And, in fact, we had a hearing recently, where we had the president of an institution in there, and he had a file that was this thick, Mr. Speaker, over 3-inches thick. And I asked him: How many pages do you have in that file? And he said: Congressman, we don't measure it by the page anymore. We measure it by the pound.

This legislation aims to address some of those concerns. H.R. 2954 would exempt small community banks and credit unions from new HMDA reporting requirements. It is my understanding that this relief would apply to other mortgage lending institutions as well, including lenders who make loans on manufactured housing.

We have an opportunity today to put our vote where our mouth is and support legislation that will grant relief to the Nation's smallest financial institutions and enable more access to credit for our customers and members of our local communities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, again, the gentleman from Minnesota for his outstanding work on this legislation and his work on behalf of our financial institutions and their customers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am now very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support Mr. EMMER's bill, H.R. 2954.

Dodd-Frank added unprecedented new regulations on industry. As has been said already by my colleagues, institutions now have to collect 25 additional fields of data. This is more than double what the banks and credit unions and other lenders had to report prior to passage of Dodd-Frank. Not only do these added requirements increase costs for all financial institutions, but it has taken lots of time for smaller community lenders to prepare for them.

This House should be well aware of two surveys of small financial institutions that reported an alarming inability of those entities to meet these new requirements.

In fact, in my meetings with small banks and credit unions from Oklahoma, all of them have raised these specific rules and requirements as being costly enough to affect their business decisions: such as how many mortgages they could feasibly originate.

All of this makes this bill not only timely, but immensely necessary. I represent a district that is full of institutions that originate fewer than 500 closed-end mortgages or open-end lines of credit in 2 years. While these new requirements were certainly well-intentioned, their impact on small institutions cannot be overstated and should not be lessened.

We as a body should continue to find ways to grow the ability of Americans to receive and to utilize financial instruments, such as mortgages. These requirements, if put on all institutions nationwide, will disproportionately affect those who are served by small financial entities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. EMMER's bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the vice chairman of our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership on this issue as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act continues to be an important resource for regulators to identify discriminatory lending activity. But the previous administration's interpretation of the act's reporting requirements has become overly burdensome for smaller financial institutions.

Community banks and credit unions are weighed down with the same compliance burdens as larger institutions, without the advantages of massive compliance departments. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's rulemaking of October 2015 on the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act would require financial institutions to report

33 new data fields for each borrower, more than double the statutory requirement laid out by Congress on top of an already detailed HMDA data collection requirement.

Fortunately, Mr. EMMER's bill, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act, would remove some of the compliance burdens placed on our Nation's smallest financial institutions by exempting depository institutions that have originated fewer than 500 closed-end mortgage loans and fewer than 500 open-end lines of credit from disclosure requirements and maintenance of mortgage loan records under the 2015 HMDA rule.

The CFPB's October 2015 rulemaking requires financial institutions to report on over 100 total data points for any loan application, regardless of whether the institution agrees to make the loan or not.

To put that in perspective, the time and resources required by a community financial institution to fill out all 100 of these data points for each application could be the difference between being able to make one more loan in a community or not. And in small communities across America, small communities like I represent, every single loan counts.

With Mr. EMMER's legislation, the community financial institutions least able to absorb compliance burdens would be able to turn their attention and resources back to providing loans for hardworking families, rather than meeting overly burdensome regulatory requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud Mr. EMMER for introducing this legislation and encourage my colleagues to be able to support this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) will control the time for the minority.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation that we are talking about today, the Home Mortgage Adjustment Act, has to be looked at in the light of the history that this country has had.

Our country has a HMDA bill, a home mortgage act, a Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, because of years, literally centuries, of discrimination and racism which has allowed for Americans to be excluded from the hope of homeownership.

When people say: Look, I believe I have been the victim of mortgage discrimination, they have been very difficult and hard-pressed to prove it because the people who issue mortgages say: Well, that wasn't the reason. Well, I know that your credit score and your downpayment and everything is just like other people, but that is not the reason.

Well, the truth is that it is the data that the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act provides for that puts people in a position where they can say: Look, I have been discriminated against. How come there is this wide racial disparity?

□ 1600

As a result of it, justice has been yielded to people who have been victims of discrimination seeking nothing more than the American Dream of homeownership.

So along comes the bill today, the bill we are considering at this moment, which essentially says that we are going to backtrack on the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act. We are not going to enforce it, even though we know that it has yielded justice for people, equal protection under the law for people, but we think that the needs of businesses are just going to be so important that we are going to backslide on the issue of justice.

So, Mr. Speaker, today I have to urge a very strong ''no'' vote on this bill because this bill says that America's commitment to liberty and justice for all is not something that this House wants to live up to. We are going to say that we can't abide government regulations even if it means we are going to advance the cause of a civil and human equality for all Americans.

Now, of course, the folks might say: Well, it is not all HMDA that we are trying to change. What we are trying to do is just stop the implementation of HMDA data, and it is only going to be for institutions that are of a smaller size; and even then, it is only going to be certain data.

Yes, they will minimize the negative impact of this legislation. But there is no doubt that this is backing off of a commitment that this Nation has made so that all people in our country can freely participate in homeownership.

They will try to minimize and say: It is only credit unions and banks that only issue about 500 or fewer mortgages. When you add all those folks up, that adds up to being a whole lot of mortgages, Mr. Speaker. It is only certain kinds of data, and that data is critical to making sure that people are included in the American Dream. So I am urging a very powerful ''no'' vote.

Now, the people who advocate this legislation say: Well, it is just too much burden on business. We can't be bothered with having business fill out forms. It is quite inconvenient.

But the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that, if this were such a problem, we would all come together and figure out how to make it easier to meet the requirements of HMDA. But that is not what is going on. They just want to delay the implementation of collection of critical data which will lead to the furtherance of the American Dream, which is homeownership.

Mr. Speaker, it was only 8 years ago that we went through the largest foreclosure crisis in the history of our country other than the Great Depression, just 8 years ago. It wasn't decades ago. It was really a few years ago, well within the memory of people who serve in this body right now. Many of us were serving in this body during that foreclosure crisis.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans were hurt. They were hurt when the value of their homes went down, and they were hurt when they saw unemployment go up. All Americans were hurt. But if we are perfectly honest, Mr. Speaker, not all Americans were hurt the same. African-American and Latino household wealth took the biggest hit of all. Because of this devastating blow, because of this shot, we saw the stripping away of African-American wealth to extreme degrees, not to mention people from Latino families.

We cannot say, on the one hand, ''Pull yourself up by the bootstraps, work hard, save, and own a home,'' and, on the other hand, take away the tools by which people can get that home. But that is exactly what we are doing right here. We are saying that we are going to take the tools that you need to make for a fairer, more open and more just neighborhood, we are going to take those tools that you rely on, and we are going to say that you cannot have those tools because the demands of business require that we don't do that; it is just too expensive, it is too burdensome, and it is too inconvenient.

Let me tell you this: 250 years of slavery, 100 years of Jim Crow, and another 70 years of social discrimination are pretty doggone inconvenient, too. If HMDA is a tool that we use to make our society a more equal and more perfect Union, then why would we backtrack on it? Why would we backslide on it? Why would we do those things?

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that it was a most interesting and passionate speech that my colleague gave.

I have some good news for him. The 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution are not repealed by this bill, and neither is HMDA. HMDA is not repealed. Even the new CFPB regulations that double the data of HMDA are not repeal.

I would urge the gentleman from Minnesota to actually read the bill, which happens to be four pages long, and he would find out that a current—a current—exemption that exists under current law for our smallest financial institutions that are trying to make loans to the very people he claims he wants to protect, that is slightly enlarged.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), who is the majority whip of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished chairman for yielding, and I appreciate my friend, Mr. EMMER, for introducing this bill to make this very modest change which does help community banks allocate capital and

make more mortgage loans out there in our country.

I would say to my friend from Minnesota, who knows I have great respect for him and his eloquence, that no one on this side of the aisle is any less interested in justice than he is.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that, as the chairman noted, this bill does nothing about eliminating protections under the Fair Housing Act or protections under the fair lending act for discrimination in housing or lending for minorities in this Nation.

This is really, instead, about continuing the theme of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, which is to relieve some burden for the smallest financial institutions across the country. The act, for example, exempts institutions with less than $50 million in assets that are in an MSA from requiring any reporting. The act, for example, exempts small banks under $50 million that are not in an MSA from any reporting.

So Mr. EMMER's bill simply continues on that theme while protecting justice and while protecting the ability to have data to make sure that we, in fact, in this country, have fair lending.

If this requirement were enacted, community lenders would be required to collect more than double the amount of data points they do now. It is some 300,000 fields of data on a loan activity report, a LAR, which is how banks measure their compliance with HMDA—300,000 lines of activity. If you have a 10 percent error rate, Mr. Speaker, you are a bad actor and can submit many more challenges to maintain your independence as a bank.

I would also argue that, on the backs of other regulatory burdens on small banks like TILA-RESPA, which was supposed to be a big improvement for consumers, it has actually hurt lending, raised costs, and limited credit. This comes on the back of that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 2954 provides needed relief for our smallest financial institutions and preserves more lending options for the markets that these banks serve.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. EMMER, for his thoughtful work.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, the underlying bill, the bill that is being attempted to be amended today, didn't drop out of the sky. We have it because there was historic, provable, and demonstrable discrimination. That is why we had it.

This bill, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act—a completely different piece which, I argue, backslides on our commitment to fair housing—would undermine our ability to stop discrimination by exempting 85 percent of the Nation's banks and credit unions and 48 percent of the Nation's nonbank lenders from having to follow the updated reporting requirements.

What are these reporting requirements? They are things that banks collect already. They are pieces of information being collected now. All they have to do is take one piece of paper that they have already prepared the documentation for and put it into another document. That is it.

Now, the application borrower's age, that is an important thing to combat age discrimination.

Credit score, name, and version of the credit scoring model, that is an important piece of information. That is already in the underwriting file and in FCRA.

The debt-to-income ratio is already in the underwriting file and is required by QM compliance.

Automated underwriting system name, that is in the underwriting file.

Other information about the property, securing the loan, and the value of the property to secure the loan, that is in the underwriting file and it is in TILA requirement.

Combined loan-to-value ratio, that is in there already because of underwriting.

Manufactured home property type, land or without land, that is in the underwriting of the file.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that information is critical because, in the manufactured housing industry, we know there is predatory lending and unfairness to borrowers a lot, so we need that kind of information to protect borrowers.

I reject the argument that somehow, if we don't have commonsense regulations and disclosure, that is going to result in more—more—loans being issued. There is no evidence to support that. What it will likely result in is more discrimination happening and perhaps people who own the banks and the credit unions just pocketing more money. But the fact that less regulation and oversight is going to yield more justice for people who have historically been excluded, there is no basis to believe that.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), who is another hardworking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time to speak in support of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act sponsored by my good friend and colleague, Mr. EMMER.

As I sit and I listen to the debates that we are having in here and I think of what people back home must be thinking, it is hard, quite often, for us here to actually see what it is like, the boots on the ground back home. So I tend to go back home, and I talk to the source. What is it that we do up here that can hurt you or help you in your business and your life?

Recently, I had a gathering of small-business owners, executives from larger businesses from across my district, and I posed a question to them: If we could only do one thing to help your business, what would that be? Would you rather us lower taxes or reduce regulation?

Without exception, every person in that room said: Reduce regulation on my business.

That surprised me.

So I asked them why. They said: Because, by lowering our taxes, you can help our bottom line, but it is the regulation that hurts our ability to actually meet the needs of our customer.

Now, when I talk to the small banks who predominantly loan to the small guy, the small-business guy, they say: It is things such as this that actually get in the way of my helping the customer.

So it is not about inconvenience to the business. It is about serving the needs of the small guy, and it is about serving the needs and actually providing access to the capital that the small-business owner, the backbone of America, actually needs.

Now, this bill is a perfect example of how we are simply reducing the burden on these businesses so they can meet the needs of the consumer much better. It doesn't do away with the regulation. It just reduces some of the reporting requirements that are onerous and that are duplicative. Basically, it tailors this data toward the small bank and the small business.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, currently, only mortgage lenders that have made fewer than 25 loans a year are exempt from this onerous data reporting requirement. All this bill does is extend that to 500 because I want our small banks to be making more than 25 loans a year to the small guy. I want them to make many more loans. Especially as this economy is improving, we want to support the small guy.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense piece of legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made a point that I thought was definitely worth mentioning. He said that he wanted to know how the law plays out boots on the ground back at home. He talked about: Does it hurt you or does it help you? The gentleman made a specific point about getting real-life, tangible experience people have with the law.

I am glad he mentioned that, and the reason why is that I talked to a woman earlier this week as I prepared to be here today. She said she scrubbed floors in a hospital for 30 years. She scrubbed floors in a hospital for 30 years. She got up every day, and she saved her money. Her family never owned a home; they rented. That is all they could ever afford to do. She applied for a loan in a bank for a home once she got her money together.

□ 1615

She was hopeful. She was optimistic. She even had a home picked out that she wanted to own and have her grandchildren and kids live with her in that home. She was denied. She had a good credit score. She saved her money. She shared with me that she felt like it was because of her race.

Now, of course, nobody is going to admit that. When it comes to mortgage lending, Mr. Speaker, the people who make decisions that exclude one group of people and include another one don't use the nasty, ugly language that all of us condemn. They don't come in here and use the N word. They don't say ugly stuff.

These people wear suits. They wear ties. They have nice, pressed white shirts. Many of them have monograms on those shirts. These are the members of the country club. Yet this lady who worked so hard for so long to own a home was denied.

It was when statistical analysis was brought forth that people decided maybe they should just give her that loan after all. It was when she went to legal aid and complained.

I can tell you this, it is the kind of thing that is important.

How do people on the ground experience the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act?

They experience it as something that gives them a chance to have a good life, too. If you never felt the sting of discrimination, maybe it is just a business regulation to you. But if you have been looked in the eye and told ''no,'' and you know that this is not right and you know it is probably because of who you are, then, and only then, will you understand why it is important not to weaken the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act.

I don't doubt that people who are offering this amendment to relieve the regulatory ''burden'' have animus in their heart. I really don't believe they do. But I will tell you this: they are listening to the folks in the country club. They are listening to the folks who are on the other side of the table. They are not listening to the people who need that mortgage, who work for that mortgage, who deserve that mortgage.

That is not who they are talking to. If they would sit down and listen to folks who just want to own a home, maybe they wouldn't see this as just some sort of a bothersome regulation. It is getting in the way of business.

How can we possibly ever allow that?

To the folks who would say that, discrimination is a theoretical concept. It might happen to some people, but none of the fine people they know in the banking industry would ever do that.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill came up because people were living with mortgage discrimination. It came up because people were being denied. It came up because people that were being told ''no'' should have been told ''yes.'' That is what is going on right here. This is why this bill, this Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act, needs to be defeated.

If you want to talk about ease of regulation, we can always talk about how to help people comply with the law. I am not against that. But what I am against is backsliding and backtracking on the progress that this country has made in favor of equal access to credit and mortgage lending. This bill is a threat to that.

There shouldn't be anyone who votes for this piece of legislation who seriously considers how damaging discrimination has been historically and who seriously considers how the lives of people who spent so much time simply trying to be part of this country have been told ''no.''

There are a lot of groups that agree. There are 173 national and State-based civil rights, fair housing, and consumer and community organizations that agree. There are 25 community labor and public interest groups that agree. They say this:

> H.R. 2954 would nearly quadruple the number of banks exempted from the key mortgage disclosures designed to detect predatory and discriminatory lending, leading to 5,400 banks being exempted, as well as an additional 487 nonbanks.

This is not a small thing. I just say that I give everybody credit for good intentions. I really do. But I think that folks need to really think about what it means to be on the other side of that desk when you are applying for that mortgage, not just the businessmen and -women who deny mortgages or grant them as they see fit.

Public Citizen says:

> This bill would eliminate race and gender home mortgage reporting requirements for lenders who make fewer than 500 closed-end mortgage loans and fewer than 500 open-end lines of credit. There is really no benefit to such an exemption, as the reporting requirements are negligible.
>
> Lenders who write mortgages obtain significant data on their customers, as they should. Reporting a few items of this data is not cumbersome. The potential harm, on the other hand, is to subvert the basic intent of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, which is to publicize whether a bank is truly serving its geographic market on a race and gender blind basis.

What about CAP, the Center for American Progress?

They say:

> While on its face this appears to be a simple regulatory relief bill, this provision would exempt the majority of mortgage lenders from new Home Mortgage Disclosure Act reporting requirements.
>
> The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act reporting is the primary source of information on the availability and quality of mortgage lending and serves a vital function in fair lending assessments.
>
> This bill would effectively paint an incomplete or inaccurate picture of lending activity in the communities across the country, making it vastly more difficult for regulators and researchers alike to assess the state of the mortgage market.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote ''no'' on this piece of legislation. It is wrong. It is not the right thing. There are other ways to do what the authors want to do. But simply saying, ''All these people are exempt and you don't have to comply,'' is not the right way to go. It will set us back as a nation. It will turn us back as a nation. I am urging a ''no'' vote.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ELLISON for the time he has spent with us today opposing this legislation. His history is such that everyone understands that he represents the least of these, that he represents working people, that he represents poor people. Whenever there is an opportunity to speak up for them, he always does.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to remember what this is all about, so let me state the facts.

HMDA data allows us to monitor mortgage lending patterns to identify underserved communities and populations to combat discriminatory lending.

HMDA data was used to determine when many of us suspected during the subprime bubble that persons of color, particularly African Americans, received predatory subprime loans at higher rates than White borrowers. They received these loans even when they qualified for prime mortgages.

The Department of Justice and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau have used HMDA data to bring fair lending cases against banks for redlining, steering, and other violations of the Fair Housing Act.

It might be true that H.R. 2954 could provide relief to some financial institutions by exempting lenders from the updated HMDA reporting requirements. What is true is that the bill would likely also have far-reaching adverse consequences for consumers, particularly those in low-income census tracts and rural areas.

Equally disconcerting is that the reduced HMDA data could stop regulators' ability to identify and stop any emerging predatory or discriminatory practices faced by those consumers.

Borrowers who take out home equity lines of credit, the HELOCs, are at risk of losing their homes to foreclosure when property values decline. In fact, the expansion of HELOCs in the mid-2000s contributed to the foreclosure crisis that many communities experienced in the last 2000s.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau noted that:

> Had open-end line of credit data like HELOCs been reported in HMDA, the public officials could have had a much earlier warning and a better understanding of potential risk, and public and private mortgage relief programs could have better assisted distressed borrowers in the aftermath of the crisis.

While I am a longtime advocate for community banks, this bill does not reduce burdens. All of the HMDA data points being discussed today will continue to be collected by banks because they need this data to originate mortgages for their customers.

I also understand that personal banking does not mean that discriminatory lending does not occur in smaller-sized institutions. In fact, the Obama administration's Department of Justice sued a community bank located in Chaska, Minnesota, with assets of $1.9 billion.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard the arguments. We are on the side of the people. I don't know who they represent over there. I simply ask for a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is fascinating listening to my friends on the other side of the aisle. It is fascinating because they tell us they want to protect the single mothers. They tell us they want to protect the people of color. They tell us they want to help and protect the poor, but they are protecting them out of their home ownership opportunities.

Because of the increased HMDA compliance on our smallest community financial institutions, they are ceasing to make these loans. But they will sleep well tonight in their apartments and in their rental homes, knowing that my good friends on the other side of the aisle protect them out of their ability to finally realize their portion of the American Dream and have that shot at home ownership.

Mr. Speaker, how many people have to lose their home ownership opportunities due to the onslaught of the onerous Federal regulations?

What is fascinating about this debate is that what they would discover is that HMDA is still the law of the land. Again, I would encourage my friends to actually read the bill. I think it is 3 pages long; maybe 3½ pages long.

HMDA doesn't go away if we enact H.R. 2954. But what it says is that for our smallest financial institutions, the HMDA requirements, the doubling of HMDA requirements, the increased burden, will not be placed on our smallest financial institutions, as we are losing one every single day. As we lose them, we lose that credit opportunity for the least of these that my friends, I know in their heart, want to help, but they are not helping them.

Listen to those who are actually trying to make these loans. By the way, I don't know of a successful business model for any bank that says: You know what? I am going to make more money if I don't lend it to you. If I refuse to make loans, if I refuse to serve my community, if I practice active racism, that will be good for my bottom line.

I am not seeing it in the Fifth District of Texas, and I highly suspect that it is difficult to find in the United States of America in the 21st century.

So I hear from the community banker in Nebraska, who says:

> Go to any community bank reporting HMDA and have them sit down and watch bank staff review a loan file. Then document the data showing how difficult it is to prevent errors.

This bank got out of the business of loaning. They said:

> We don't need the ulcers created by such stress from the fear of the regulators.

I heard from a community bank in Oklahoma that said:

> Because of Dodd-Frank, we no longer offer purchase house loans. We are servicing only the ones we have on the books.

Thank you Dodd-Frank and HMDA. May I have another.

I heard from a community bank in Nevada that said:

> The mortgage regulations intended to help the consumer have been particularly harmful. My bank is a very small community bank servicing communities in rural Nevada. We used to do quite a bit of residential mortgage lending, but hardly any now, due to the restrictive regulations.

□ 1630

So, again, I would just ask that my friends on the other side of the aisle open up both their hearts and their heads and see how many people are being hurt by the cumulative impact of this regulatory tsunami hitting those who loan the money to the least of these to make sure that they can achieve their version of the American Dream.

And where was all the angst, Mr. Speaker? Where was all the angst? My friends on the other side of the aisle talk about statistics. Well, here is a statistic that comes from the Federal Reserve: When the qualified mortgage rule of the CFPB is fully implemented, 30 percent fewer Blacks and Hispanics, people of color, will be able to get mortgages versus 2010. There is a statistic.

And I would say, Mr. Speaker, perhaps that is even a more valuable statistic when it comes to looking at the increased HMDA burden placed by the CFPB on our community financial institutions. Maybe that is a more important statistic than even the 20-some-odd new fields of HMDA data that CFPB is requiring on the smallest banks and credit unions in America.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say: Oh, we care about the plight of these community banks. Well, why are we still losing one a day, and why do you tell us that you care about their plight and their ability to loan money but you don't vote with us?

Fortunately, some Members on the other side of the aisle in the other body over my shoulder, Mr. Speaker—there is actually a bipartisan bill in the Senate that does exactly what H.R. 2954 does. I am very happy to say that it was a bipartisan bill coming out of the Financial Services Committee, also enjoying some Democratic support.

But, again, I just don't think my friends who are debating now have read the bill. I encourage them to read the bill, and every Member ought to support H.R. 2954 and support the opportunity to buy a home in the American Dream.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 693, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ELLISON. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. ELLISON moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2954 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:
>
> Page 3, beginning on line 11, strike ''paragraph (3)'' and insert ''paragraph (4)''.
>
> Page 3, line 13, strike ''paragraph (3)'' and insert ''paragraph (4)''.
>
> Page 4, line 4, strike the quotation mark and ending period and insert after such line the following:
>
> ''(3) ATTESTATION REQUIREMENT.—
>
> ''(A) IN GENERAL.—For each year with respect to which a depository institution is exempt from the requirements of paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) by reason of paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection, the president and chief executive officer for such depository institution shall submit a written attestation to the Bureau and the appropriate Federal financial services regulator that—
>
> ''(i) the institution is in compliance with all relevant Federal fair lending laws and regulations;
>
> ''(ii) the institution has established adequate internal controls to detect whether the institution's business models and personnel policies and practices operate in a fair manner and provide equal opportunities for minorities and women in the institution's workplace; and
>
> ''(iii) the senior executives, managers, loan officers, and other employees of the institution who are substantially involved in the underwriting of residential mortgage loans for the institution have completed anti-discrimination and diversity training on an annual basis.
>
> ''(B) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'appropriate Federal financial services regulator' means—
>
> ''(i) with respect to a bank or savings association, the appropriate Federal banking agency (as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act); and
>
> ''(ii) with respect to a credit union, the National Credit Union Administration.''.

Page 4, line 5, strike ''Section 304(i)(3)'' and insert ''Section 304(i)(4)''.

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

As we have heard today, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act is a critical civil rights bill. It is a civil rights bill designed to increase opportunity for all Americans. It is about liberty and justice for all. It is about the Equal Protection Clause. It is about those things that men and women laid their whole lives down for to make this country more fair, more equal.

The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act's intent was to ensure that equal opportunity was given to everyone with respect to mortgages. The law is necessary, given our country's long history of discrimination. Through slavery, we took away rights and freedoms of Black men and women for 250 years. We made them property rather than human beings. It was followed by nearly a century of segregation and disenfranchisement.

As a result of it, people stood up to say we have got to have laws to protect people. We might not be able to change hearts and minds, but we can change behavior. And HMDA helped change behavior.

We are still fighting to make sure we have a more equal society. The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act empowers the Department of Justice, State attorneys general, Consumer Bureau, and the public to fight back against discriminatory lending and monitor access to mortgage credit by traditionally underserved communities and populations.

If a financial institution denies a family a mortgage, they can provide a number of excuses for that denial. Only the data collected through the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act proves that there is a broader issue of discrimination at play.

This bill, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act, exempts institutions from certain HMDA reporting requirements if they originate 500 or fewer closed-end loans, which includes mortgages and car loans, and institutions that issue 500 or fewer open-ended loans. That is nearly 6,000 institutions across America that will stop reporting HMDA data if this bill goes into effect.

This opens the door for discrimination. It opens the door for red-lining, and it is not acceptable. That is why I am offering a motion to recommit that would ensure that individual banks affected by this bill take steps to reduce discrimination in mortgage lending. If opening the door for discrimination is not the intent of the bill, there should be no issues why my amendment is not passed.

My amendment simply says that the CEO and the president of any financial institution now exempted from collecting and reporting important HMDA data fields must attest that, one, the institution is compliant with all relevant fair-lending laws; two, the institution has established adequate internal controls to detect whether the institution provides equal opportunity; and, three, the institution's senior executives, managers, and loan officers and other employees who are substantially involved in underwriting residential mortgage loans complete an anti-discrimination and diversity training.

Ultimately, my amendment is meant to ensure that each exempted institution is properly incentivized to do what they're supposed to do: lend to all qualified borrowers. By holding the CEO accountable, my amendment ensures that lenders will take the actions necessary to begin to overcome historic racism, sexism, and other discrimination just like HMDA was intended.

If it is a fact that the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act is not designed to open the door and green-light discrimination, then this amendment is a commonsense proposal to make sure that that does not happen and that the leader of the institution maintains responsibility for that not happening.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to vote for this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend and colleague from Minnesota restating, in his motion to recommit, what is essentially already current law; but, unfortunately, he adds on yet one more form for community financial institutions to fill out on top of the 18.7 gazillion forms they already have to fill out, the cost of which ultimately is imposed upon those who are trying to find credit and find affordable credit.

And I would remind the gentleman from Minnesota again, every single financial institution impacted by H.R. 2954 still must submit HMDA data. They are still subject to HMDA. For the third time, they are still subject to HMDA. And I am sure that all will be glad to hear Federal regulators still have statutory authority to take any formal enforcement actions against entities for violations of the laws or rules.

But why, when we are trying to make it easier for the least of these to buy a home, are we trying to, instead, my friends on the other side of the aisle, make it more difficult by adding yet more forms, forms that also say: Do you know what? Even though this is America, you are guilty until proven innocent.

That is a whole different argument, and I wish we had time to develop it here today, Mr. Speaker.

But here is what we need to do. We need to make sure that struggling, hardworking Americans have homeownership opportunities, and the regulatory burden that came out of the previous administration is making it more difficult. So, now, to think that we would double the HMDA requirement data—double—for our smallest financial institutions that are fighting for survival, that are trying to help our constituents buy homes is unthinkable; to add yet one more Federal law, one more Federal form on top of all the others that we have, is just unfathomable. It is unthinkable. It will only harm those whom we are trying to help, and I would urge all Members to reject the motion to recommit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ELLISON. 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.

FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 195.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 696, I call up the bill (H.R. 195) to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—KEVIN AND AVONTE'S LAW OF 2017

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Kevin and Avonte's Law of 2017''.

Subtitle A—Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program Reauthorization

SEC. 211. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Missing Americans Alert Program Act of 2017''.

SEC. 212. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE MISSING ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE PATIENT ALERT PROGRAM.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 240001 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12621) is amended—

*(1) in the section header, by striking ''**ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE PATIENT**'' and inserting ''**AMERICANS**'';*

(2) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) GRANT PROGRAM TO REDUCE INJURY AND DEATH OF MISSING AMERICANS WITH DEMENTIA AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES.—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this section, the Attorney General, through the Bureau of Justice Assistance and in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services—

''(1) shall award competitive grants to health care agencies, State and local law enforcement agencies, or public safety agencies and nonprofit organizations to assist such entities in planning, designing, establishing, or operating locally based, proactive programs to prevent wandering and locate missing individuals with forms of dementia, such as Alzheimer's Disease, or developmental disabilities, such as autism, who, due to their condition, wander from safe environments, including programs that—

''(A) provide prevention and response information, including online training resources, and referrals to families or guardians of such individuals who, due to their condition, wander from a safe environment;

''(B) provide education and training, including online training resources, to first responders, school personnel, clinicians, and the public in order to—

''(i) increase the safety and reduce the incidence of wandering of persons, who, due to their dementia or developmental disabilities, may wander from safe environments;

''(ii) facilitate the rescue and recovery of individuals who, due to their dementia or developmental disabilities, wander from safe environments; and

''(iii) recognize and respond to and appropriately interact with endangered missing individuals with dementia or developmental disabilities who, due to their condition, wander from safe environments;

''(C) provide prevention and response training and emergency protocols for school administrators, staff, and families or guardians of individuals with dementia, such as Alzheimer's Disease, or developmental disabilities, such as autism, to help reduce the risk of wandering by such individuals; and

''(D) develop, operate, or enhance a notification or communications systems for alerts, advisories, or dissemination of other information for the recovery of missing individuals with forms of dementia, such as Alzheimer's Disease, or with developmental disabilities, such as autism; and

''(2) shall award grants to health care agencies, State and local law enforcement agencies, or public safety agencies to assist such agencies in designing, establishing, and operating locative tracking technology programs for individuals with forms of dementia, such as Alzheimer's Disease, or children with developmental disabilities, such as autism, who have wandered from safe environments.'';

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting ''competitive'' after ''to receive a'';

(B) by inserting ''agency or'' before ''organization'' each place it appears; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: ''The Attorney General shall periodically solicit applications for grants under this section by publishing a request for applications in the Federal Register and by posting such a request on the website of the Department of Justice.''; and

(4) by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

''(c) PREFERENCE.—In awarding grants under subsection (a)(1), the Attorney General shall give preference to law enforcement or public safety agencies that partner with nonprofit organizations that appropriately use person-centered plans minimizing restrictive interventions and that have a direct link to individuals, and families of individuals, with forms of dementia, such as Alzheimer's Disease, or developmental disabilities, such as autism.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022.

''(e) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

''(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'unresolved audit finding' means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

''(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

''(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

''(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

''(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

''(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

''(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

''(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant programs under this section, the term 'nonprofit organization' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this section to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this section and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

''(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

''(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts made available to the Department of Justice under this section may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this section, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice, unless the head of the relevant agency or department, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

''(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

''(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

''(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification—

''(A) indicating whether—

''(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

''(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

''(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

''(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

''(f) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded by the Attorney General to determine if grant awards are or have been awarded for a similar purpose.

''(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

''(A) a list of all such grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any such grants awarded; and

''(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded multiple grants to the same applicant for a similar purpose.''.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and every year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary

and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the Missing Americans Alert Program, as amended by subsection (a), which shall address—

(1) the number of individuals who benefitted from the Missing Americans Alert Program, including information such as the number of individuals with reduced unsafe wandering, the number of people who were trained through the program, and the estimated number of people who were impacted by the program;

(2) the number of State, local, and tribal law enforcement or public safety agencies that applied for funding under the Missing Americans Alert Program;

(3) the number of State, local, and tribal local law enforcement or public safety agencies that received funding under the Missing Americans Alert Program, including—

(A) the number of State, local, and tribal law enforcement or public safety agencies that used such funding for training; and

(B) the number of State, local, and tribal law enforcement or public safety agencies that used such funding for designing, establishing, or operating locative tracking technology;

(4) the companies, including the location (city and State) of the headquarters and local offices of each company, for which their locative tracking technology was used by State, local, and tribal law enforcement or public safety agencies;

(5) the nonprofit organizations, including the location (city and State) of the headquarters and local offices of each organization, that State, local, and tribal law enforcement or public safety agencies partnered with and the result of each partnership;

(6) the number of missing children with autism or another developmental disability with wandering tendencies or adults with Alzheimer's being served by the program who went missing and the result of the search for each such individual; and

(7) any recommendations for improving the Missing Americans Alert Program.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 is amended by striking the item relating to section 240001 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 240001. Missing Americans Alert Program.''.

Subtitle B—Education and Outreach

SEC. 231. ACTIVITIES BY THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN.

Section 404(b)(1)(H) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (34 U.S.C. 11293(b)(1)(H)) is amended by inserting '', including cases involving children with developmental disabilities such as autism'' before the semicolon.

Subtitle C—Privacy Protections

SEC. 241. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) CHILD.—The term ''child'' means an individual who is less than 18 years of age.

(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given that term in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304(e)).

(3) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term ''law enforcement agency'' means an agency of a State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe that is authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(4) NON-INVASIVE AND NON-PERMANENT.—The term ''non-invasive and non-permanent'' means, with regard to any technology or device, that the procedure to install the technology or device does not create an external or internal marker or implant a device, such as a microchip, or other trackable items.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(6) UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ''unit of local government'' means a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general government below the State level.

SEC. 242. STANDARDS AND BEST PRACTICES FOR USE OF NON-INVASIVE AND NON-PERMANENT TRACKING DEVICES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and leading research, advocacy, self-advocacy, and service organizations, shall establish standards and best practices relating to the use of non-invasive and non-permanent tracking technology, where a guardian or parent has determined that a non-invasive and non-permanent tracking device is the least restrictive alternative, to locate individuals as described in subsection (a)(2) of section 240001 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12621), as added by this title.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In establishing the standards and best practices required under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall—

(A) determine—

(i) the criteria used to determine which individuals would benefit from the use of a tracking device;

(ii) the criteria used to determine who should have direct access to the tracking system; and

(iii) which non-invasive and non-permanent types of tracking devices can be used in compliance with the standards and best practices; and

(B) establish standards and best practices the Attorney General determines are necessary to the administration of a tracking system, including procedures to—

(i) safeguard the privacy of the data used by the tracking device such that—

(I) access to the data is restricted to law enforcement and health agencies determined necessary by the Attorney General; and

(II) collection, use, and retention of the data is solely for the purpose of preventing injury to or death of the individual wearing the tracking device;

(ii) establish criteria to determine whether use of the tracking device is the least restrictive alternative in order to prevent risk of injury or death before issuing the tracking device, including the previous consideration of less restrictive alternatives;

(iii) provide training for law enforcement agencies to recognize signs of abuse during interactions with applicants for tracking devices;

(iv) protect the civil rights and liberties of the individuals who use tracking devices, including their rights under the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

(v) establish a complaint and investigation process to address—

(I) incidents of noncompliance by recipients of grants under subsection (a)(2) of section 240001 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12621), as added by this title, with the best practices established by the Attorney General or other applicable law; and

(II) use of a tracking device over the objection of an individual; and

(vi) determine the role that State agencies should have in the administration of a tracking system.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The standards and best practices established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall take effect 90 days after publication of such standards and practices by the Attorney General.

(b) REQUIRED COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each entity that receives a grant under subsection (a)(2) of section 240001 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12621), as added by this title, shall comply with any standards and best practices relating to the use of tracking devices established by the Attorney General in accordance with subsection (a).

(2) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall determine whether an entity that receives a grant under subsection (a)(2) of section 240001 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12621), as added by this title, acts in compliance with the standards and best practices described in paragraph (1).

(c) APPLICABILITY OF STANDARDS AND BEST PRACTICES.—The standards and best practices established by the Attorney General under subsection (a) shall apply only to the grant programs authorized under subsection (a)(2) of section 240001 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12621), as added by this title.

(d) LIMITATIONS ON PROGRAM.—

(1) DATA STORAGE.—Any tracking data provided by tracking devices issued under this program may not be used by a Federal entity to create a database.

(2) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—Nothing in this title may be construed to require that a parent or guardian use a tracking device to monitor the location of a child or adult under that parent or guardian's supervision if the parent or guardian does not believe that the use of such device is necessary or in the interest of the child or adult under supervision.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Frelinghuysen moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 195 with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 115–55.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate, insert the following:

DIVISION B—EXTENSION OF CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

SEC. 2001. The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (division D of Public Law 115-56) is amended—

(1) by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting ''February 16, 2018''; and

(2) by adding after section 147 the following:

''SEC. 148. Funds appropriated by the Department of Defense Missile Defeat and Defense Enhancements Appropriations Act, 2018 (division B of Public Law 115-96) may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

''SEC. 149. Amounts made available by section 101 for 'Department of Agriculture—Food and Nutrition Service—Child Nutrition Programs' to carry out section 749(g) of the Agriculture Appropriations Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-80) may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to ensure that the program can be fully operational by May 2018.

''SEC. 150. Amounts made available by section 101 for 'National Aeronautics and Space

Administration—Exploration' may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch capability schedules for the Space Launch System launch vehicle, Exploration Ground Systems, and Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle programs.

''SEC. 151. Amounts made available by section 101 for 'Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Office of the Inspector General' may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to sustain staffing levels achieved on June 30, 2017.

''SEC. 152. Amounts made available by section 101 for 'Small Business Administration—Business Loans Program Account' may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to accommodate increased demand for commitments for general business loans authorized under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)).

''SEC. 153. For 2018, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may make temporary adjustments to the Section 8 housing choice voucher annual renewal funding allocations and administrative fee eligibility determinations for public housing agencies in an area for which the President declared a disaster in 2017 or 2018 under title IV of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 et seq.), to avoid significant adverse funding impacts that would otherwise result from the disaster and that would otherwise prevent a public housing agency from leasing up to its authorized level of units under contract (but not to exceed such level), upon request by and in consultation with a public housing agency and supported by documentation as required by the Secretary that demonstrates the need for the adjustment.''.

SEC. 2002. The Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (division A of Public Law 115-96) is amended by striking section 1002.

This division may be cited as the ''Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018''.

DIVISION C—HEALTHY KIDS ACT

SEC. 3001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Helping Ensure Access for Little Ones, Toddlers, and Hopeful Youth by Keeping Insurance Delivery Stable Act'' or the ''HEALTHY KIDS Act''.

SEC. 3002. SIX-YEAR FUNDING EXTENSION OF THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2104(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(a)), as amended by section 3201(a) of the CHIP and Public Health Funding Extension Act (division C of Public Law 115–96), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (20)(B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) by striking paragraph (21) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(21) for fiscal year 2018, $21,500,000,000;

''(22) for fiscal year 2019, $22,600,000,000;

''(23) for fiscal year 2020, $23,700,000,000;

''(24) for fiscal year 2021, $24,800,000,000;

''(25) for fiscal year 2022, $25,900,000,000; and

''(26) for fiscal year 2023, for purposes of making two semi-annual allotments—

''(A) $2,850,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2022, and ending on March 31, 2023; and

''(B) $2,850,000,000 for the period beginning on April 1, 2023, and ending on September 30, 2023.''.

(2) PREVENTION OF DUPLICATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, insofar as funds have been appropriated under subsection (a)(21) of section 2104 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd), as such subsection is in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, to provide allotments to States under the State Children's Health Insurance Program established under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.) (whether implemented under title XIX, XXI, or both, of the Social Security Act) for fiscal year 2018—

(A) any amounts that are so appropriated that are not so allotted and obligated before the date of the enactment of this Act, are rescinded; and

(B) any amount provided for CHIP allotments to a State under this section (and the amendments made by this section) for such fiscal year shall be reduced by the amount of such appropriations so allotted and obligated before such date.

(b) ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2104(m) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(m)), as amended by section 3201(b) of the CHIP and Public Health Funding Extension Act (division C of Public Law 115–96), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''(19)'' and inserting ''(25)'';

(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''and 2017'' and inserting '', 2017, and 2023''; and

(iii) in clause (ii)—

(I) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking ''and paragraph (10)''; and

(II) in subclause (I), by inserting ''(or, in the case of fiscal year 2018, under paragraph (4))'' after ''clause (i)'';

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking ''2018'' and inserting ''2023'';

(C) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''(or, in the case of fiscal year 2018, by not later than the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of the HEALTHY KIDS Act)'' after ''before the August 31 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year''; and

(iii) in the matter following subparagraph (B), by striking ''or fiscal year 2016'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2016, fiscal year 2018, fiscal year 2020, or fiscal year 2022'';

(D) in paragraph (9), by striking ''2018'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(E) by amending paragraph (10) to read as follows:

''(10) FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023.—

''(A) FIRST HALF.—Subject to paragraphs (5) and (7), from the amount made available under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (26) of subsection (a) for the semi-annual period described in such subparagraph, increased by the amount of the appropriation for such period under section 3002(b)(2) of the HEALTHY KIDS Act, the Secretary shall compute a State allotment for each State (including the District of Columbia and each commonwealth and territory) for such semi-annual period in an amount equal to the first half ratio (described in subparagraph (D)) of the amount described in subparagraph (C).

''(B) SECOND HALF.—Subject to paragraphs (5) and (7), from the amount made available under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (26) of subsection (a) for the semi-annual period described in such subparagraph, the Secretary shall compute a State allotment for each State (including the District of Columbia and each commonwealth and territory) for such semi-annual period in an amount equal to the amount made available under such subparagraph, multiplied by the ratio of—

''(i) the amount of the allotment to such State under subparagraph (A); to

''(ii) the total of the amount of all of the allotments made available under such subparagraph.

''(C) FULL YEAR AMOUNT BASED ON REBASED AMOUNT.—The amount described in this subparagraph for a State is equal to the Federal payments to the State that are attributable to (and countable towards) the total amount of allotments available under this section to the State in fiscal year 2022 (including payments made to the State under subsection (n) for fiscal year 2022 as well as amounts redistributed to the State in fiscal year 2022), multiplied by the allotment increase factor under paragraph (6) for fiscal year 2023.

''(D) FIRST HALF RATIO.—The first half ratio described in this subparagraph is the ratio of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the amount made available under subsection (a)(26)(A); and

''(II) the amount of the appropriation for such period under section 3002(b)(2) of the HEALTHY KIDS Act; to

''(ii) the sum of—

''(I) the amount described in clause (i); and

''(II) the amount made available under subsection (a)(26)(B).''.

(2) ONE-TIME APPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023.—There is appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $20,200,000,000 to accompany the allotment made for the period beginning on October 1, 2022, and ending on March 31, 2023, under paragraph (26)(A) of section 2104(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(a)) (as added by subsection (a)), to remain available until expended. Such amount shall be used to provide allotments to States under paragraph (10) of section 2104(m) of such Act (as added by paragraph (1)) for the first 6 months of fiscal year 2023 in the same manner as allotments are provided under subsection (a)(26)(A) of such section 2104 and subject to the same terms and conditions as apply to the allotments provided from such subsection (a)(26)(A).

(c) EXTENSION OF THE CHILD ENROLLMENT CONTINGENCY FUND.—Section 2104(n) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(n)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(i) by striking ''2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2016'' and inserting ''2010 through 2014, 2016, and 2018 through 2022''; and

(ii) by striking ''fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2017'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015, 2017, and 2023''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2016'' and inserting ''2010 through 2014, 2016, and 2018 through 2022''; and

(ii) by striking ''fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2017'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015, 2017, and 2023''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''or a semi-annual allotment period for fiscal year 2015 or 2017'' and inserting ''or in any of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 (or a semi-annual allotment period for fiscal year 2015, 2017, or 2023)''.

(d) EXTENSION OF QUALIFYING STATES OPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2105(g)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(g)(4)) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''THROUGH 2017'' and inserting ''THROUGH 2023''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 2104(f)(2)(B)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(f)(2)(B)(ii)), as amended by section 3201(c) of the CHIP and Public Health Funding Extension Act (division C of Public Law 115–96), is amended—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking ''for the month (as defined in subclause (II))'' and inserting ''(as defined in subclause (II)) for the month'';

(B) in subclause (II), by inserting ''., as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the HEALTHY KIDS Act,'' after ''section 2105(g)(4)(A)''; and

(C) in subclause (VI)—

(i) by inserting ''., as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the HEALTHY KIDS Act'' after ''., section 2105(g)(4)''; and

(ii) by inserting ''., as so in effect'' after ''under section 2105(g)(4)''.

(e) EXTENSION OF EXPRESS LANE ELIGIBILITY OPTION.—Section 1902(e)(13)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)(13)(I)) is amended by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''.

(f) ASSURANCE OF AFFORDABILITY STANDARD FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2105(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(d)(3)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''UNTIL OCTOBER 1, 2019'' and inserting ''THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2023''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(i) by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(ii) by striking ''The preceding sentence shall not be construed as preventing a State during such period'' and inserting ''During the period that begins on October 1, 2019, and ends on September 30, 2023, the preceding sentence shall only apply with respect to children in families whose income does not exceed 300 percent of the poverty line (as defined in section 2110(c)(5)) applicable to a family of the size involved. The preceding sentences shall not be construed as preventing a State during any such periods''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1902(gg)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(gg)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''UNTIL OCTOBER 1, 2019'' and inserting ''THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2023''; and

(B) by striking ''September 30, 2019,'' and inserting ''September 30, 2023 (but during the period that begins on October 1, 2019, and ends on September 30, 2023, only with respect to children in families whose income does not exceed 300 percent of the poverty line (as defined in section 2110(c)(5)) applicable to a family of the size involved)''.

(g) CHIP LOOK-ALIKE PLANS.—

(1) BLENDING RISK POOLS.—Section 2107 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397gg) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) USE OF BLENDED RISK POOLS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title (or any other provision of Federal law) shall be construed as preventing a State from considering children enrolled in a qualified CHIP look-alike program and children enrolled in a State child health plan under this title (or a waiver of such plan) as members of a single risk pool.

''(2) QUALIFIED CHIP LOOK-ALIKE PROGRAM.—In this subsection, the term 'qualified CHIP look-alike program' means a State program—

''(A) under which children who are under the age of 19 and are not eligible to receive medical assistance under title XIX or child health assistance under this title may purchase coverage through the State that provides benefits that are at least identical to the benefits provided under the State child health plan under this title (or a waiver of such plan); and

''(B) that is funded exclusively through non-Federal funds, including funds received by the State in the form of premiums for the purchase of such coverage.''.

(2) COVERAGE RULE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended in subparagraph (A)(iii), by inserting ''or under a qualified CHIP look-alike program (as defined in section 2107(g) of the Social Security Act)'' before the comma at the end.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

(h) AVAILABILITY OF UNUSED FISCAL YEAR 2018 REDISTRIBUTION AMOUNTS.—Any amounts that have been redistributed to States under subsection (f) of section 2104 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd) for fiscal year 2018 that are not, or will not be, expended by the end of that fiscal year shall be—

(1) adjusted by the Secretary before the end of fiscal year 2018 to reflect an updated estimate of shortfalls under subsection (f)(2)(A) of such section; and

(2) available for redistribution under subsection (f) of such section for subsequent fiscal years.

SEC. 3003. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) CHILDHOOD OBESITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Section 1139A(e)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b–9a(e)(8)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and $10,000,000'' and inserting ''., $10,000,000''; and

(2) by inserting after ''2017'' the following: ''., and $30,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2023''.

(b) PEDIATRIC QUALITY MEASURES PROGRAM.—Section 1139A(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b–9a(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Out of any'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of any'';

(2) by striking ''there is appropriated for each'' and inserting ''there is appropriated—

''(A) for each'';

(3) by striking ''., and there is appropriated for the period'' and inserting ''.;

''(B) for the period'';

(4) by striking ''. Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.'' and inserting ''.; and''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, $90,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out this section (other than subsections (e), (f), and (g)).

''(2) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 3004. EXTENSION OF OUTREACH AND ENROLLMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2113 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397mm) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking ''and $40,000,000'' and inserting ''., $40,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting after ''2017'' the following: ''., and $120,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2023''.

(b) MAKING ORGANIZATIONS THAT USE PARENT MENTORS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE GRANTS.—Section 2113(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397mm(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking ''or community-based doula programs'' and inserting ''., community-based doula programs, or parent mentors''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) PARENT MENTOR.—The term 'parent mentor' means an individual who—

''(A) is a parent or guardian of at least one child who is an eligible child under this title or title XIX; and

''(B) is trained to assist families with children who have no health insurance coverage with respect to improving the social determinants of the health of such children, including by providing—

''(i) education about health insurance coverage, including, with respect to obtaining such coverage, eligibility criteria and application and renewal processes;

''(ii) assistance with completing and submitting applications for health insurance coverage;

''(iii) a liaison between families and representatives of State plans under title XIX or State child health plans under this title;

''(iv) guidance on identifying medical and dental homes and community pharmacies for children; and

''(v) assistance and referrals to successfully address social determinants of children's health, including poverty, food insufficiency, and housing.''.

(c) EXCLUSION FROM MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Section 1902(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)) is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph (14), relating to income determined using modified adjusted gross income, by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(J) EXCLUSION OF PARENT MENTOR COMPENSATION FROM INCOME DETERMINATION.—Any nominal amount received by an individual as compensation, including a stipend, for participation as a parent mentor (as defined in paragraph (5) of section 2113(f)) in an activity or program funded through a grant under such section shall be disregarded for purposes of determining the income eligibility of such individual for medical assistance under the State plan or any waiver of such plan.''; and

(2) by striking ''(14) EXCLUSION'' and inserting ''(15) EXCLUSION''.

SEC. 3005. EXTENSION AND REDUCTION OF ADDITIONAL FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION FOR CHIP.

Section 2105(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(b)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting ''and during the period that begins on October 1, 2019, and ends on September 30, 2020, the enhanced FMAP determined for a State for a fiscal year (or for any portion of a fiscal year occurring during such period) shall be increased by 11.5 percentage points'' after ''23 percentage points,''.

SEC. 3006. MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1941 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''., and, in accordance with subsection (b)(3), for the purposes of subparagraph (B) of such subsection''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the first sentence, by inserting ''pursuant to paragraph (1)'' after ''in the Fund'';

(ii) by inserting after the first sentence the following sentence: ''Amounts in the Fund pursuant to paragraph (3) shall be available in advance of appropriations but only if the total amount obligated from the Fund does not exceed the amount available to the Fund under such paragraph (3).''; and

(iii) in the last sentence, by striking ''sentence'' and inserting ''sentences''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR STATE ACTIVITIES RELATING TO MECHANIZED CLAIMS SYSTEMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the amount made available under paragraph (1), there shall be available to the Fund, for expenditures from the Fund in accordance with subparagraph (B), for fiscal year 2023 and thereafter, $980,000,000, to remain available until expended.

''(B) PURPOSES.—The Secretary shall use amounts made available to the Fund under subparagraph (A) to pay to each State which has a plan approved under this title, for each quarter beginning during or after fiscal year 2023 an amount equal to—

''(i) 100 percent minus the percent specified in clause (i) of section 1903(a)(3)(A) of so much of the sums expended by the State during such quarter as are attributable to the activities described in such clause;

''(ii) 100 percent minus the Federal medical assistance percentage applied under clause (iii) of such section of so much of the sums expended during such quarter (as found necessary by the Secretary under such clause) by the State as are attributable to the activities described in such clause; and

''(iii) 100 percent minus the percent specified in section 1903(a)(3)(B) of so much of the sums expended by the State during such quarter as are attributable to the activities described in such section.''.

DIVISION D—SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN HEALTH-RELATED TAXES

SEC. 4001. EXTENSION OF MORATORIUM ON MEDICAL DEVICE EXCISE TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4191(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''December 31, 2017'' and inserting ''December 31, 2019''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to sales after December 31, 2017.

SEC. 4002. DELAY IN IMPLEMENTATION OF EXCISE TAX ON HIGH COST EMPLOYER-SPONSORED HEALTH COVERAGE.

Section 9001(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking ''December 31, 2019'' and inserting ''December 31, 2021''.

SEC. 4003. SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL FEE ON HEALTH INSURANCE PROVIDERS.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 9010(j) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1),

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting '', and ending before January 1, 2019, and'', and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) beginning after December 31, 2019.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2018.

DIVISION E—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 5001. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The budgetary effects of division C and each succeeding division shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of division C and each succeeding division shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(c) CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217 and section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of division C and each succeeding division shall not be estimated—

(1) for purposes of section 251 of such Act; and

(2) for purposes of paragraph (4)(C) of section 3 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 as being included in an appropriation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 696, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise this afternoon to present the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, the Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act of 2018. This critical legislation extends government funding through February 16. Our current funding expires tomorrow night, and if Congress does not pass this bill and the President does not sign it into law before then, the government will shut down.

It is our congressional duty to prevent that from happening and to ensure that the American people have access to government programs and services they depend on. The additional time, just under a month, will allow congressional leadership and the White House to come to a final budget agreement.

This legislation includes a very limited number of technical changes to ensure good governance. The bill also includes language to continue the Children's Health Insurance Program through fiscal year 2023 to help sick children from low-income families get better and to ensure they have healthy and happy futures. Additionally, this proposal extends several healthcare-related tax provisions.

Mr. Speaker, a continuing resolution is not the preferred way to conduct the Nation's fiscal business, but at this point it is absolutely necessary to avoid a costly, destabilizing government shutdown. It is my hope that this will be the last continuing resolution, that leadership of the House and Senate and the White House will quickly come to an agreement on top-line spending levels and that we can complete our appropriations work for fiscal year 2018 in short order.

□ 1645

It is critical that we enact all 12 full-year funding bills to ensure that our Armed Forces have the resources they need to accomplish their missions both at home and abroad and that our government supports and maintains programs that are important to the lives and livelihoods of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this critical legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Since President Trump's draconian budget was released, Democrats have warned Republicans that a bipartisan budget agreement was needed to adequately invest in American families and communities.

Without a budget agreement, programs as diverse as Head Start, job training, and terrorism prevention grants are in danger of inadequate funding at best, yet Republican leadership and the White House have no appropriations strategy other than endless continuing resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the most powerful country in the world now being completely run by a Republican government can't keep the lights on longer than 4 weeks at a time. How did we get here? If this bill passes, is there any reason to believe we will not be back in the same place next month?

Stumbling from one crisis to another is an irresponsible way to govern. Attempting to avoid a shutdown every month denies Federal agencies budget certainty and wastes taxpayer dollars.

Several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have lamented the damage that the CRs inflict on our military. I agree with them, yet time after time, they vote for the exact same strategy they bemoan.

I encourage my colleagues to take action; hasten agreements on immigration and spending caps that would lead to responsible funding bills that keep Americans safe.

It is also unconscionable that, instead of helping advance a solution to this impasse, the President personally reneged on his word and rejected a bipartisan compromise on immigration. Protection of American teens and young adults from impending deportation to a country they don't know is the key to unlocking a responsible, bipartisan spending agreement. How can we expect to ever fund the government responsibly when the President cannot be trusted to keep his word?

The majority has failed to address a number of high-priority items, like funding to combat the opioid epidemic, pension protections, and funding for community health centers.

The continuing resolution lacks an important anomaly requested by the administration to provide additional disaster loans for the Small Business Administration while the disaster supplemental is stalled in the Senate. Without this language, the Small Business Administration will run out of funds by the end of January and will be unable to continue approving loan applications from Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, this is not how the appropriations process is supposed to work. It is time to protect young Americans, lift budget caps, and allow Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and all of our committee members to roll up our sleeves and get to work.

Instead of wasting dollars on time, on further CRs, we should, instead, immediately pass a budget agreement and help DREAMers, which would facilitate full-year funding bills the committee could begin writing today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), the chairman of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill.

This short resolution, this continuing resolution will give us time to negotiate it, but it addresses our Nation's priorities. Let's be very clear. If this does not pass now, go to the Senate, pass there and then sent to the President for his signature and signed, the Federal Government will shut down this week.

So we all know, as the chairman said, that short-term CRs, that is not something that we want to do. That is not our preference. But again, if this one does not pass now, the Federal Government will shut down.

This is no time to shortchange our first responders, our military as we continue to recover from natural disasters in places all throughout our country and, again, respond to the threats that face us abroad. This is no time to shut down the Federal Government.

The CR supports ongoing transportation safety missions, including air traffic control.

Again, we cannot allow the government to shut down and put all of that in jeopardy.

It allows us to continue to house the most vulnerable families, especially our veterans. This is not the time to let them down by shutting, again, the Federal Government down.

It also funds medical care for millions of children, blocks burdensome health insurance taxes, and, again, supports mission-critical defense activities. This is not the time to let them all down and shut down the Federal Government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this short-term CR will allow us to work together to find common ground on, again, full-year 2018 bills that meet both our defense and domestic priorities.

Something else, Mr. Speaker. I want the country to know that we also have to deal, have to solve the issue of DACA. Both sides have been at fault for, in many cases, refusing to sit down in good faith to negotiate a solution. This CR gives us some time to make sure we solve that issue.

It is not time now for political games and gamesmanship and politics. We need to be able to solve the issue of those young folks. We can't do that if the government is shut down.

It is time for leadership, for courage. Let's sit down, work out our differences, help secure the border, and provide a solution for these deserving kids.

For that reason and for so many others, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we do not allow the Federal Government to shut down. Voting against this resolution is a vote to shut down the Federal Government. I believe that will be highly irresponsible, so I urge a strong ''yes'' vote.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are now 4 months into the fiscal year and this is our fourth continuing resolution. The gentleman says now is the time to work things out. Every Democrat voted to extend the fiscal year by 90 days. Nothing was worked out. Why? Because you spent all your time on a tax bill giving 83 percent of the resources to the richest people in America.

Republicans control all the levers of the legislative process: the House, the Senate, the White House. They have the votes on their own to keep the government open or choose to shut it down, as they did by policy some years ago for 16 days.

We don't want to shut down the government. Keeping the government open by passing appropriations bills is the most basic responsibility of any governing majority. This governing majority has not sent a single—not one—appropriation bill to the President of the United States, not one.

Republicans ought to have gotten this work done in the spring and summer, but they wasted their time trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That is all they did.

After failing to do so, they asked for more time in September, and we voted, every one of us, to give them that time. They squandered it. They had to do two more extensions. They squandered that time, and now they want us to have another time where they can squander more time.

Instead of using the extra time to do the job of governing, they wasted it on passing a tax overhaul that added $1.5 trillion in new deficit spending and raised taxes on the middle class. So here we are again, Mr. Speaker.

Americans are right to be frustrated by the inability or unwillingness of the Republican-led Congress to do its job and keep the government open.

You have 241 votes. Get them. Get them. You have the authority to do it, and you have the responsibility to do it. Get the votes.

Even some Republican lawmakers are openly expressing frustration with their own leadership. Let me quote Representative MARK MEADOWS. He hit the nail on the head yesterday when he asked: ''What's the plan? When are we going to deal with immigration?''

The previous speaker talked about dealing with it. We haven't dealt with it. Put something on the floor. You haven't done it.

''When are we going to deal with spending?'' This is MARK MEADOWS. ''At what point do you quit kicking the can down the road''—this is MARK MEADOWS, Republican, not me—''and passing just another continuing resolution in hopes that things get better in a few weeks?''

Democrats don't want the government to shut down.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. We don't have the power to shut it down either. It is entirely in the hands of the majority.

By the way, on that previous CR, 90 of your Members voted against it. Did they vote against the military? Did they vote against the first responders? Did they vote against education funding?

And we wring our hands about the military funding. Do you think it is any easier to run a nondefense agency with a CR? You are wrong if you think that. They undermine our domestic agencies as well, and I hope that they are equally worried about the impact that doing one short-term funding bill after another has on the domestic side.

Americans are frustrated that their Congress can't agree on what we agree on.

Republicans have previously supported the principles of parity when raising spending caps. That was the PAUL RYAN deal. He is the Speaker. He said, yes, we will increase military and domestic the same. That was his deal, PAUL RYAN, the Speaker.

That is all we are asking for, ''PAUL RYAN, make your deal again,'' and he won't do it. Instead, he just wants to keep kicking the can down the road once, twice, thrice, now four times.

Yes, we want, as the previous speaker said, all DREAMers to stay in this country. We all want to reauthorize the CHIP program to prevent 9 million children from losing their health insurance. I dare you to put it on the floor. It will pass with every vote in this House. No, you want to blackmail us into passing something that we don't like and we don't think is good for the country.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we want to address other urgent health priorities as well. You want to pass CHIP, but you do not want to pass the community health centers. My colleague BETTY MCCOLLUM told us about that. Many CHIP children will have no place to go—you pass the bill, but no place to go. So why don't Republicans sit down and reach agreement?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle, don't shut down the government. I implore them. Use your majority not to delay but to govern. And I tell them, Democrats are still ready to work with you, as we have

been throughout, to sit down and reach bipartisan compromise on our most pressing challenges. We voted to give you 120 days to do that; now you want some more time.

You come to the door and ask for some cake, and your neighbor says, ''Come back tomorrow,'' and you come back tomorrow and you ask for the same thing, and he says, ''Come back tomorrow,'' and you go back the next day, and he says the same thing, ''Come back tomorrow.'' That is what the Republicans are saying, ''come back tomorrow,'' ''come back tomorrow,'' ''come back tomorrow,'' but there has been no tomorrow.

Vote against this CR.

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

□ 1700

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you can tell from the previous speaker how eager our Democratic colleagues are to shut down this government: Get the votes to keep this government open because we won't provide them; get the votes to keep funding our military and security, but we won't provide them; get the votes to provide healthcare long-term for our children and families, because our Democratic colleagues won't provide not one vote; get the votes to delay the damaging impact of ObamaCare taxes, the health insurance tax, the Cadillac tax, and medical device; you get those votes, Republicans, because we are not going to give you even one of them.

These taxes are so damaging to our families, to our workers, and to our job-creators, it is sending jobs out of America overseas.

Get the votes, Republicans, because we claim we support this, we just won't support it with our votes.

It is regrettable because these are bipartisan issues, and politics are shutting this government down.

I urge my Democratic colleagues to stand with Republicans on behalf of children, and families, and workers. Keep this government open.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that our side hasn't been consulted.

The Republicans have 238 votes to pass anything here. They have the vast majority. You only need 218 votes, so if you wanted to pass it, you could do it right now. You could have done it a month ago, you could have done it 2 months ago, you could have done it 3 months ago.

But there is something fundamentally wrong on that side of the aisle, and, of course, you have to deal with the other body where you hold a majority, and you can't get it done there either.

Now, in football, you would call this fumbling the ball. In baseball, you would call it flubbing the ball.

Honestly, if you can't consult with our side of the aisle, why would you expect anybody would want to work with you anyway? You treat us like we are from, I don't know, Borneo. Why would you think we would want to vote for something that we can't agree with because of its essential unfairness?

I really can't understand why you are putting the Republic through all these contortions.

You don't have a budget. You know, we have been asking for a budget, and you don't make decisions about departments until you have a budget because you might underfund one department or overfund another department, so we want to do this in a very orderly way.

But our Republican friends appear to hope the government will function with no road map. Are they really asleep behind the wheel of the car? They are sure careening, and they might even hit a brick wall.

If the Republicans cannot put together a framework agreement for a vote this week, it is safe to say they have fumbled and flubbed every opportunity they have had. It reminds me of the old Looney Tunes character Elmer Fudd. They can't even catch Bugs Bunny when he is staring them right in the face. They aren't making progress and, indeed, are losing ground.

There was hope on September 8, when we voted the first time for a short-term extension, that you could actually reach agreement. But here it is, the brand new year, and we still don't have agreement.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentlewoman from Ohio an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. So here we are, January 18, 2018, 1 day before the risk of another shutdown, and their fiddling is unprecedented. Don't have a budget framework; can't make decisions; don't consult with our side. Why should we be in a helpful mood?

We were always told Republicans are stern taskmasters. Not only have they failed to pass a budget, now they have added a trillion more dollars to the deficit and the long-term debt because they wanted to give tax giveaways to all their donors.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this sinking effort and demand action for a final, full-year funding plan. That is what is responsible. That is essential, and that is what the American people expect.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure what the people of Borneo did to deserve the wrath of my colleague from Ohio, but perhaps she can explain later to them.

But here is the deal. The Energy and Commerce Committee did work across the aisle, or attempted to, to fully fund the Children's Health Insurance Program, to fully fund community health centers, to fully fund extenders; and, at every step of the way, when my colleagues and friends from the other side of the aisle asked me to stop and work with them, we tried. We couldn't reach full agreement on the pay-fors at the time, but we tried, and we worked in good faith with each other.

Fifteen Democrats on the House floor voted to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program for a full 5 years. By the way, that equals the longest extension and the most generous funding to help children and pregnant women that has ever been done for that program. We sent it over to the Senate. Unfortunately, they couldn't find agreement; so we came back, and we kept extending it.

By the way, the Democratic leader of the House, Mr. Speaker, Ms. PELOSI, said what we are doing today, by putting full funding for Children's Health Insurance Program for the longest extension in the history of the program, a full 6 years, is, and I quote, sadly: ''A bowl of doggy-doo, put a cherry on top and call it a chocolate sundae.'' Is that what this has devolved to?

We have an opportunity today, with the help and leadership of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to fully fund our States' Children's Health Insurance Program for not 5 years but a full 6 years. This is the longest extension in the history at the strongest funding level in history.

So when you vote ''no'' today, as you all apparently are going to do, you are voting to close the government and deny our States, but, more importantly, the children and pregnant women, access to children's health insurance. The cancelations that go out, the notices, are on your terms.

Let me tell you what the children's hospitals have said to Congress:

''Kids cannot wait, fund CHIP now.''

''Congress has a chance to pass a long-term extension of CHIP that will provide security for millions of kids. The continuing resolution being considered by Congress includes a 6-year extension of CHIP. Children's hospitals support a long-term extension of CHIP and urge Congress to take this opportunity to pass CHIP this week. The time is now to extend funding for this lifeline millions of children and their families count on every day.''

That is children's hospitals. Can't we put the partisan divide aside and at least fund children's health insurance for children and pregnant women in this country and keep the government open? That is the question before us today.

The question before us today is: Do you want to keep the government open

and the services provided and 6 years of full funding for children's health insurance and pregnant women, or will you vote against it? It is as simple as that. The rest is just political rhetoric.

So let's fund CHIP. Let's take care of our families and kids and keep the government open.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the well-informed ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for my Republican chairman from Oregon, but he just forgets completely, as so many speakers on the GOP side have, that they are in the majority, and they have a significant majority. They can do whatever they want.

For him to suggest that somehow he can't bring up a CHIP bill that also includes all these other health programs he mentioned, the community health centers—I could also mention all the Medicare extenders that are not included in this bill.

This bill basically either lets expire or continues to expire so many things that are important for the health of the American people, not only the community health centers, which expire in a few weeks; not only the Medicare extenders, which includes the therapy caps for seniors and Medicare; the home visiting program for seniors; the special diabetes program; the teaching health centers; the National Health Service Corps; all of these things; also, the safety net hospitals. As of January 1, the DSH or safety net programs for all these hospitals around the country that have to take care of so many poor people, that funding has expired and they have actually had to cut the funding.

So how do you stand up here and say to me and the American people that somehow you care about these things, you want to deal with these things? You are not dealing with these things.

What are you doing here again? Once again, you are bringing a bill to the floor that has all kinds of repeal of taxes. I don't even want to get into the deal. These are the taxes that help fund the Affordable Care Act, the medical device tax; there are several of them.

All you do here is bring up tax cuts, or tax repeals, and now you are trying to give the impression, because you have the 6-year reauthorization for CHIP and have eliminated funding and help for all of these healthcare programs, that somehow you care.

Well, when the kids that get the CHIP funding can't go to a community health center or can't go to a hospital because they are suffering and don't have the funding, where do they go?

We know that CHIP is a great program, but many of the kids who have the insurance under CHIP have to go to community health centers. And all I hear from my community health centers and other teaching hospitals is they are ready to send out the pink slips. They may have to close. They are not sure they can help these people.

So it is a complete joke to suggest that somehow you care. You have the votes; you can do whatever you want. You are not doing it.

Sure, I also agree that DACA, the DREAMers, are going to suffer because that is not being addressed either. But the main thing I want to stress is, you are not addressing all these other healthcare programs that are just as important as CHIP, just as important, and make CHIP essentially not viable because they are not being addressed.

So please don't suggest to me that you care. The right vote here is to vote against this CR.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from the Garden State of New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), my good friend, just told you all the things that weren't in this bill that he wished were. My distinguished chairman, Mr. WALDEN, just whispered in my ear that we have put everything you talked about in bills, subcommittee, full committee, and on the floor, and you voted against them every time this year, every time.

Now, where I come from, you vote for what is in the bill, not what is not in the bill. I wished we had a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in this bill. I wish we fully funded our military for the rest of the year in this bill. I wish we, by an act of Congress, gave Texas A&M the national championship in football in this bill. That is not going to happen.

What is in this bill? We fully fund the Children's Health Insurance Program for every State of the Union and the territories for 6 years; never been done before. Fully fund children's health insurance for every State and territory in the Union for 6 years, at existing levels, and it increases each year for the next 6 years. It is fully paid for, fully offset.

Not every Democrat, but almost every Democrat, has voted against that already twice, and if they vote against it this evening, they will vote against it for the third time.

I am the manager of the Republican baseball team. If you strike, if you miss it three times, it normally means you are out. I hope that some of my friends on the minority side will, tonight, vote with us to fund SCHIP and to fund the government for the next month.

I am one of the Republicans who support DACA. I am on the Dream Act. I am also on the Republican alternative. I would love to vote for DACA, but the deadline for DACA is not until March. The SCHIP programs expired in September. We need to pass this CR and send it to the Senate. Vote ''yes.''

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

□ 1715

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, which ignores the urgent need of the American people. The Federal Government's fiscal year started October 1 of last year.

But instead of fulfilling their responsibility to fund our government in a timely manner, President Trump and the Republicans spent months working to pass their tax scam.

Now, because they didn't do their jobs, Mr. Speaker, Republicans are asking us to vote to kick the can down the road again. This is no way to run a government.

The American people deserve immediate action on the critical issues that matter to our country. We need a budget agreement in order to do that. We need to keep our government open. We need to protect our national security, and we need to meet the needs of our community and these hardworking families.

We need to protect workers' pensions by enacting responsible reforms that will save struggling pension plans. We need to provide disaster relief to our fellow Americans who were hit hard by hurricanes and wildfires last year. We need to reauthorize the Special Diabetes Program, which funds treatment and prevention programs for Native Americans. And, yes, we need to pass a Dream Act, which protects children from President Trump's cruel termination of DACA.

The American people overwhelmingly support these priorities, but you won't find them in this bill. Instead, Republicans have turned this CR into a tax bill that has provisions that didn't make it in their original tax plan.

While this legislation does finally reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, it abandons our community health centers, where parents take their children to get the care that they need.

Make no mistake, this bill will cause layoffs at clinics, which means fewer people in my district throughout Minnesota will get the care that they need.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has total control in Washington, but instead of working for the American people, President Trump and his allies in Congress are ignoring them.

Minnesotans and Americans deserve a better deal than the one that they are getting from this Republican Congress. It is time for President Trump and the Republicans to end the chaos, to truly work across the aisle to find ways that we can fund this government responsibly, and to address our national priorities.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

Here it is in a nutshell: Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN saw to it that we passed all 12 of the appropriations bills and sent them to the Senate, where not a single one has been allowed to come to the floor because of Democratic Senators who profess they want to keep the government going but vote ''no.''

And because the Democrats in the Senate have barred the consideration of any of these bills, here we are. We have no choice but to vote for this bill if we want to keep the government open. It is the only game in town.

And those on the other side who profess they want to keep the government going today will vote ''no.'' I don't understand that logic.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only chance we have to keep the government operating to be sure that the American taxpayers' money is being spent properly and adequately, but for the purpose of keeping our government open.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill, and let's move on.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this continuing resolution. It is staggering that yet again we are punting one of our core obligations as a Congress: funding government programs.

We should be negotiating spending levels for 2018 for both defense spending and nondefense spending. We should have spent the last few months fulfilling our responsibility as legislators by writing bipartisan bills to fund programs that help working families and the middle class and the vulnerable, to support evidence-based scientific research, and to help working people get the skills they need to find good jobs with good wages.

Instead, Republicans have continued their irresponsible trend of continuing resolution after continuing resolution. They fail to govern. They create chaos.

This bill fails to support community health centers, which serve as the primary healthcare provider for over 27 million people, including disproportionately rural and low-income populations.

In 2016, over 376,000 patients across Connecticut received care at the Connecticut Community Health Center. They cut taxes for insurance companies while failing to fund community health centers. It is shameful.

They won't work with Democrats to set budget numbers and ensure parity for defense and nondefense spending. They put services and investments critical to families and our communities at risk; from apprenticeships to education for students with disabilities, to childcare, to afterschool programs that help working families make ends meet, and to financial aid for students attending college.

They include an extension for the Children's Health Insurance Program, but they cut out the Medicare extenders and other healthcare programs. But they should be ashamed of the months of fear and turmoil they have caused to children and their families who will be unable to get help at community healthcare centers.

They had the time to cram a tax scam through the Congress before the end of the year.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Yet, for the vulnerable children, we have dragged our feet for months. Shameful.

Let me just say, the President Trump and the Republican majority who try to cast the blame for this shutdown on the Democrats—let me just remind this body and the American people that 9 months ago the President said: Our country needs a good shutdown in September to fix this mess.

Well, the President may get what he wants and what he desires as a government shutdown, but it is not because of the Democrats. It is because of the intractability of the Republican majority in this House and this administration to move forward on behalf of the American people. It is not the Democrats. President Trump has called for a shutdown of this government.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Energy.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the prior speaker that, in fact, the President issued a Statement of Administration Policy in support of this bill, which keeps the government open.

But I also rise in support of this bill and in strong support of a 6-year, long-term funding for CHIP.

We all came to Congress to fight for our district, and particularly our kids. The Michigan CHIP serves nearly 40,000 kids, and if CHIP isn't reauthorized long term, it is going to be disastrous for our communities, which is why they are depending on us, which is why it is in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, back in 2015, I helped broker the bipartisan, bicameral deal that led us to the last reauthorization of CHIP. It wasn't easy, but we got there by working together. Over the course of the past year, we have been steadfast in our resolve to reauthorize CHIP.

In our committee, we worked tirelessly to advance commonsense legislation that is going to extend CHIP, as well as community health centers. Last November, we passed the comprehensive bill on the House floor. Later in the year, we passed a CR that included short-term funding for CHIP.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does that. I would urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this continuing resolution, which is, yet again, a complete abdication of our responsibilities.

Instead of adopting fully funded appropriations bills or an omnibus with an actual chance of passing this Congress, we are mired in this unbreakable habit of passing continuing resolutions.

The Republicans' most recent proposal does nothing to renew funding for the more than 1,400 community health centers across the country or the 25 million Americans they serve after they let funding run out in September.

According to the National Association of Community Health Centers, if Congress does not act soon, 28,000 sites could close, 50,000 staff could be laid off, and 9 million Americans could lose access to care.

When did this program, which has always had bipartisan support in this body, become a partisan issue?

These abdications are simply immoral. Our Republican colleagues say: We don't have the money to fund these programs, but somehow they were silent on that issue when they gave a handout to giant corporations that add more than $1.5 trillion to the deficit.

While their donors rested peacefully over the holidays knowing that their tax cuts were safe, Republicans continued to torment 800,000 hardworking young people by refusing to pass the Dream Act. 122 DREAMers lose their protected status every day, and Republicans have not been brave enough to do what is right.

These courageous individuals are teaching in our schools, working in our communities, and serving in our military.

I have had the privilege of meeting DREAMers in south Florida and in the Halls of this Capitol. Their hopes and hard work signify what is best about America, and by any reasonable definition, they are Americans. This is their home.

It is past time for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work on a bipartisan spending package that promotes the middle class, protects DREAMers, and finally assures the American people that their government is working.

I simply will not support any spending bill that fails to do so. Make no mistake, Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House. A government shutdown will land squarely in their lap.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the decision to attach a 6-year extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program, as this is much overdue.

CHIP, which is known as PeachCare for Kids in Georgia, has been a very successful program in covering the medical needs in our State.

However, this isn't the first time we have tried to extend this program that is so vital to children all across our country.

We passed legislation out of the Energy and Commerce Committee addressing a long-term fix in October. We then passed it in the House in November. We funded a short-term fix in December.

It is time our colleagues across the aisle quit holding children's healthcare hostage. Now is the time to pass this and continue discussions on community health centers, graduate medical education programs, and other extenders.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WALDEN, Chairman BURGESS, and my colleagues from the Energy and Commerce Committee for their work. I urge my colleagues to pass this and help our Nation's children.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, this habit of short-term funding extensions and kicking the can down the road—I heard that a few times—are irresponsible and have to stop. We need a long-term funding bill.

Democrats have come to the table and offered bipartisan solutions. Republicans have dismissed them. Let's put a bill to help the DREAMers on the floor.

This leadership is acting out of fear, and their intransigence and incompetence is going to lead to a shutdown.

Instead of using 9 million kids as a bargaining chip, I bet the majority could pass a permanent children's health extension today. There are 9 million children at risk of losing health coverage, 200,000 of them in my home State of New Jersey, and we could save $6 billion.

I cannot believe that this bill has an unpaid-for delay of the medical device tax, Mr. Speaker. That was part of the Affordable Care Act. That industry agreed to pay that tax. We just did a tax bill for corporations that added over $2 trillion in deficit.

Last I checked, medical device companies are corporations.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. What are we doing putting it in place in a tax law and a budget bill now and then a month later?

Just this week, The New York Times ran a piece titled: ''Can Your Hip Replacement Kill You?''

The article describes a man named Dr. Stephen Tower, who was given an artificial hip with a defect in the device.

It is in your bill.

Doctors had to do a second surgery. They found cobalt leaking from the device, causing a condition called metallosis, destroying muscle, tendons, ligaments, harming Dr. Tower's heart and brain as well.

Despite Dr. Tower's complaints to colleagues and the manufacturer, they continued to market it.

How dare the Speaker of the House question why we want DACA in this legislation when he has got a bill that—32 million Americans use medical devices. There is no Federal FDA test for most of those devices.

□ 1730

They have got the court, they bribed doctors, and it is in your bill, but we could not take care of those 800,000 people. Mr. Speaker, we need a different issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislative package to fund the government and to authorize CHIP, the longest such authorization for CHIP ever.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN secured passage of all 12 appropriations bills before the beginning of the new fiscal year on October 1. It is the Democrats in the Senate who have refused to permit these bills to come to the floor. No good explanation has been given as to why that occurred.

Chairman WALDEN brought through the Energy and Commerce Committee a CHIP reauthorization package that passed this House in November. We must continue to ensure governmental operations such as paying our troops on time and making sure our homeland security apparatus is fully operational.

The CHIP portion of this bill is a major accomplishment. Nine million low-income children depend on CHIP, and the Congressional Budget Office estimates that CHIP will actually save taxpayer funds in the long run. Let's keep the government open, and let's fund CHIP.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote in favor of this legislation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, we are back again for the third continuing resolution this fiscal year. This makes no sense, and it is no way to govern. And let me be clear and repeat what my colleagues have said: Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House, but they just can't seem to pass a real budget.

If Republicans want Democratic votes, they need to have our priorities reflected in that budget—priorities like protecting the American Dream for 1.5 million DACA recipients with the Dream Act, thousands of young people who fear deportation because of the cruel termination of the DACA program; priorities like community health centers and protecting the retirement savings of working families; priorities like addressing the opioid epidemic that ravages our communities; priorities like infrastructure, and education, and real healthcare protections for everyone.

So if the Republican majority—yes, the majority—shuts down the government because they won't look to get our Democratic priorities addressed, then they will have to answer to communities across the country who are looking for a permanent budget, not something that kicks the can down the road for another few weeks.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, this is not a real solution. We will not substitute one family's pain for another's gain. This is about the lives and livelihoods of millions of people. It is about the soul of our country, and Americans deserve a better deal.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New Jersey for allowing me to join this important debate. My friends on the other side are showing why the people, the American people, like root canals, head lice, and colonoscopies more than Congress. In a brazen act that hurts our youth in poverty, congressional Democrats are going to vote against basic healthcare for these needy kids.

The CHIP program is their only choice for their health. Nearly half a million young Texans depend upon SCHIP. It expired September 30 of this year. This bill we vote on tonight will extend SCHIP for 6 more years.

Mr. Speaker, I beg my colleagues, listen to your heart, to your soul, and the voice of these kids who want basic healthcare. Vote for SCHIP today. Vote for the CR.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the

gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman WALDEN and Chairman BURGESS for all of the hard work they put into reauthorizing CHIP. This is a 6-year reauthorization of the CHIP program, the longest CHIP reauthorization Congress has ever passed. The House already passed a full CHIP authorization last year. By the way, we also reauthorized the community health centers. Most Democrats voted against that.

Democrats need to put politics aside and support the bill for the sake of our children. CHIP reauthorization will ensure funding for 200,000 children in Florida's CHIP program. In addition, this bill has my legislation that protects CHIP buy-in programs. This allows children who aren't eligible for traditional CHIP to buy into the CHIP program. It makes sense. Inconsistent guidance from CMS jeopardized these buy-in programs. This bill will provide clarity and protect about 12,000 children in the State of Florida who participate in the buy-in program.

Mr. Speaker, I support this particular bill. Please, let's reauthorize CHIP for the sake of our children.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 195 which continues funding the government through February 16. It pays our troops and provides for a 6-year extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program. Thirty-six percent of the children in my district are covered under CHIP, and I am pleased to support this legislation to ensure that they continue to have access to care that has been delayed by obstructionist Democrats in this body and over in the Senate.

While I support passage of this bill, I want to draw attention to the fact that there are other important provisions that have previously passed this House, yet have fallen by the wayside as Members sought a compromise on the final bill. I will go through those in a minute.

Again, I am pleased that we are passing a bill that continues funding for the government, pays for our troops, and extends funding for the CHIP program.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues, though, not to forget other important health initiatives that must be addressed, and I hope they will join me in seeing that these initiatives are again taken up after passage of the bill. Those provisions that need to be considered include two of my bills: first, the Youth Empowerment Act which empowers youth to make healthy decisions; and secondly, language from the Health Coverage State Flexibility Act also needs to be continued.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), chairwoman of the Ethics Committee.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the CR, in part, because we need to extend CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program, for the 104,000 children in Indiana who currently rely on the program.

We must provide longer term stability to CHIP, and we have the opportunity to do so here today. CHIP is crucial for families who would otherwise slip through the cracks. Their income disqualifies them from traditional Medicaid, but it is not high enough to afford family health insurance. CHIP provides children with comprehensive health and dental services, and it has helped decrease the rate of uninsured children in Indiana to an all-time low of 5 percent.

The families of these 104,000 children in Indiana rely on CHIP and, this 6-year reauthorization will grant States the much-needed certainty in administering CHIP for American children across the country and stability for the Hoosier families who depend on the program.

Furthermore, today's CR includes a 2-year relief from the medical device tax. America tops the world in medical innovation, and relief from this tax will further reinforce this leadership. The previous 2-year suspension of this damaging tax has allowed device companies, many of which call Indiana home, to invest in research and development and invest in high-quality, high-paying jobs and medical innovation, all to the benefit of patients who need them the most.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the CR. Not only does it provide long-term stability for CHIP and relief from the medical device tax, but it also provides government funding through February 16 to prevent a shutdown. Like Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I hope this will provide the time we need to complete the fiscal year 2018 appropriations bills.

Voting ''yes'' today is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes'' on final passage.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Children's Health Insurance Program provides health coverage to low-income children and pregnant women who have an annual income above the Medicaid eligibility levels but have no health insurance. It provides care, in other words, Mr. Speaker, for some of the most vulnerable families in our Nation. It covers nearly 5,000 children in my home State. In fact, in fiscal year 2016, North Dakota received $19 million in CHIP funding.

I encourage all of my colleagues to now support this important program that has historically had bipartisan support. I also want to urge my colleagues to quickly take up funding for community health centers, the special diabetes program, and other health programs that require extension.

Community health centers in North Dakota are already feeling the negative effects of this funding uncertainty, particularly in hiring and leasing decisions.

Mr. Speaker, we must not vote ''no'' on this CR because of what is not in the bill, but we must vote ''yes'' because what is in the bill is critical to the health of our children.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we need to keep the government open, and we need to keep the government funded, and we need to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program. Now, in the Energy and Commerce Committee, we passed CHIP, reauthorized for 5 years out of committee in October. We passed it out of the full House in November. We are now back to authorize it for a full 6 years. We do not need any additional pay-fors.

This will help 177,000 children in Pennsylvania and millions across the country. CHIP funding will be exhausted next month in Pennsylvania. Right now, some States already face a shortfall in their funding as the program has not yet been fully reauthorized for all of fiscal year 2018.

It is past time that we provide a long-term solution and stability for families who depend on this quality, affordable coverage. I have heard from so many constituents—I have heard from many Democrats—urging us to reauthorize CHIP. Tonight, we have a vote to keep the government open and to reauthorize CHIP. The right vote on this bill is a ''yes'' vote. That is the vote I will be taking on behalf of my constituents and this country.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I commend her for her great leadership as our ranking member on the Appropriations Committee—as we say, the almighty powerful Appropriations Committee on which I was proud to serve with the gentleman, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Congresswoman LOWEY.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed, though, that the legislation that is brought to the floor today falls so very short of our responsibilities to the

American people. When it comes to considering this bill, which the Republicans are bragging supports CHIP, it is important to review the facts. The facts are these: the CHIP proposal that the Republicans boast was on the floor in October, this or that, was funded by taking money from other children's programs, and that is why it was not to be supported by us. It is also important to remember that the CHIP reauthorization expired September 30.

□ 1745

So here we are with our fourth continuing resolution. That means, on September 30, we were supposed to not only reauthorize CHIP but to pass an omnibus bill to fund the government. Republicans were not able to make the decisions necessary to do that, so we had one extension, another extension, another extension. This is the fourth extension.

Now, for somebody who doesn't know what a CR is, that is our Washington lingo. It is a continuing resolution. What it says is that the funding for the country will be continued at the same rate as it was in the previous year regardless of the fact that other challenges have emerged.

So, by engaging in the failure to pass an omnibus bill and engage instead in these short-term continuing resolutions, this inadequacy does not give certainty to our military. General Mattis has told us that the military cannot go on these every-2-weeks, every-month CRs. We need to know. We need to have an omnibus that recognizes the full complement of our needs, and they are different from last year.

It does not fund the fight against opioid addiction. We have talked about this. We have authorized language. We have put up some money. But throughout our country, there is an opioid epidemic that needs to be addressed with full funding for it—not just conversation or rhetoric, but funding.

It does not address some of the crises facing our veterans, whether it is their infrastructure, housing, whatever, or additional funding that is needed for our veterans over and above whatever it was last year, and this ignores that need.

It ignores the fact that we have some issues that we have to address regarding endangered pensions in our country, which have a direct relationship to the economic well-being of America's working families, pensions paid into, pensions having a shortfall, to honor the responsibility.

It doesn't protect the DREAMers. We could protect the DREAMers in all of this, but it is missing an opportunity.

This takes us right back to the CHIP. It does not fund community health centers that provide primary care for 27 million Americans.

So these priorities are bipartisan. Nothing I mentioned on this list is anything that does not have bipartisan support in the Congress, that has not been openly discussed—bipartisanship, transparency, unity—unifying us around these issues. We did not put priorities forward that were partisan, but those that had bipartisan—strong bipartisan—support.

So when our colleagues come to the floor and say, ''Oh, we are doing CHIP,'' CHIP is a wonderful initiative. It was one of the first bills that I passed and sent to President Obama when I was Speaker of the House. This is of high value to all of us on both sides of the aisle, but not high enough of a value to put it in its proper context. So this reauthorization of CHIP that they are putting here, this funding for CHIP is not really funding.

Let me just make a distinction. We wanted 10 years for CHIP, to make it permanent—so we don't have to go through this—and remove all doubt, remove the uncertainty as to whether this healthcare would be available to those children who need it. We said, 10 years, you save $6 billion; $6 billion, you save. You do 6 years, as in this bill, you save $1 billion. Why wouldn't we want to save $6 billion?

Nonetheless, my concern is that they chose to bring a bill to the floor that isolates CHIP away from the other essentials that are a part of the delivery of that healthcare service to children. It does not reauthorize community health centers which provide, as I say, vital care to 26 million Americans. It does not extend the Medicare extenders so necessary, especially for our seniors with home visiting care and other initiatives.

It does not address the Medicaid DSH, disproportionate share challenge that is across America. Ask your friends in rural America, especially, about that. Therapy services, diabetes, and teaching health centers for primary care doctors, all are completely out of this bill.

That is why I am so proud of the legislation introduced by Congressman MCEACHIN today which has the full complement. It is nothing additional. It is how we have always proceeded with the priority of children's health in a package that is about family health and delivery of service.

As the President, himself, tweeted this morning: ''CHIP should be part of a long-term solution, not a 30-day or short-term extension.'' We like it 10 years; they have it 6 years. But it shouldn't be in this bill because this bill is sort of a half-baked facade to make it look as if we are keeping government open.

We are keeping government debilitated by not addressing, coming to agreement on the omnibus bill that we know that we have to do that addresses the needs of our military, as it recognizes the security provisions in the domestic bill that are about security, whether it is the State Department, Veterans Affairs, homeland security, or antiterrorism activities of the Justice Department; and also, the fact that the strength of our country is measured in many ways: certainly, our military, which we are very proud of, and the agencies I mentioned, but also in the health, education, and well-being of the American people.

So we are here. What does government do?

Government does transportation. How can you, if you are in the Transportation Department, make commitments when you are on a short fuse of—what is it?—2 weeks in December, now 4 weeks that they want to go forward.

Why don't we just settle it? Grow up. Take responsibility. Get this done for the American people.

Nobody I know wants a shutdown of government—well, maybe except for the President, who said, ''Our country needs a good shutdown.'' He said that in May. I think with his experience as President now, he probably knows there is no such thing as a good shutdown. We don't want a shutdown.

By the way, if there is one, this would be the first time there would be a shutdown in recent history that took place when one party had the White House, had the Senate, and had the House of Representatives, had full responsibility for managing and for leveraging, for getting the job done to fund our country for another year with certainty. This has 2-year provisions in what we are negotiating with the Republicans.

So, really, coming to the floor and hiding behind CHIP to hide the shortcomings and the lack of taking responsibility for our responsibilities to the American people is really a sad thing. That is why Mr. MCEACHIN's bill and our previous question, which had the full complement to make CHIP really work, was the way to go.

Sadly, although I object to the process of one short-term continuing resolution of last year instead of looking to the future for next year—I disapprove of that process—the substance of this legislation makes it totally unacceptable, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of this funding extension, which includes a vital, long-term reauthorization of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP. This bill provides the longest extension in the history of the CHIP program and provides security for millions of kids and pregnant mothers.

It is important to remember the House has already acted responsibly three times to extend CHIP. In November, this Chamber passed the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act on a bipartisan vote. The bill not only would have extended CHIP for 5 years, but it also addressed other important public health programs like federally qualified health centers. Regretfully, partisanship and political gamesmanship left that bill to languish in the Senate.

My constituents remain frustrated that the majority of my Democratic

colleagues in this Chamber have voted three times against CHIP. The delays and posturing are inexcusable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone in the House votes to pass this extension today so we can get to work on quickly reauthorizing community health centers and other important public health priorities.

I encourage my colleagues to put aside the political games, vote ''aye'' on the bill—the only correct vote—and then tell the Senate to do the right thing as well.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who is the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed when I hear my Republican colleagues talk about how they brought CHIP to the floor and they brought community health centers to the floor. What they forget to mention is that every time they did that, they included pay-fors, in other words, funding measures that would basically sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

We have seen a concerted effort not only to try to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which failed, but then to do everything possible to make it more difficult for people to get their health insurance. We know that in the tax plan—or tax scam—that they passed a few weeks ago that they were so determined to spend all their time on that, what did they do? They eliminated the mandate that people have health insurance. The CBO estimates that there will be 13 million Americans, over the next few years, who will lose that health insurance.

When they talked about CHIP in those previous times, what did they do? They put in provisions that cut the Prevention Fund that funds all the programs for children.

They put in a provision that said that, if you didn't pay your health insurance within 30 days, you would lose it. CBO estimated that something like half a million Americans would lose their insurance because of that provision.

They put in provisions that said that people who got their Medicare had to pay more for it—pay even 100 percent—depending upon their income.

They have done everything possible to sabotage the healthcare system. For them to get up and say, ''Oh, we care about kids; we care about community health centers,'' nothing is further from the truth because everything has been done to sabotage the healthcare system.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), who is the chairwoman of the House Republican Conference.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to face a very critical deadline in many States, including my home State of Washington. CHIP funding will run out.

More than 60,000 kids in my State count on CHIP and need certainty. This funding bill reauthorizes CHIP for 6 years, the longest extension in the program's history. Now Democrats are threatening to hold this up again for a DACA deal.

Now, to be clear, I want a DACA deal, too, and I am disappointed that we don't have one yet, but that is no reason to punish children across the country. Today we are voting to prioritize our Nation's children, and it is time for the Democrats to join us.

I also want to take this opportunity to stress the importance of reauthorizing the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education Program, which expired in September. These centers face a looming deadline of January 31 to decide whether or not to recruit their July 2018 classes.

Without a long-term solution, the centers across our country cannot make the important decisions that will affect the lives of hundreds of residents.

Unfortunately, one teaching health center in Memphis has already made that decision. They closed their doors earlier this year, leaving 25 residents without a place to continue their medical training and reducing patient access to care. Although reauthorization of the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education Program was not included in this bill, we must get this done as soon as possible.

I look forward to working with the chairman and the committee moving forward, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this 6-year reauthorization of CHIP.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to close.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a responsibility to invest in initiatives to defend the country and grow the economy. Instead of continuing down a rudderless path of CR after CR, we must pass a bipartisan budget agreement and protect DREAMers, which will enable the Appropriations Committee to responsibly write full-year funding bills.

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

□ 1800

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for his hard work and cooperation on this legislation.

The choice before us today is actually very, very simple. It is a choice the American people are watching. The choice is: Do you fund the government while you work out the other differences, or do you close the government?

It is a binary choice. It is not about all the other things I would like in this bill or you would like in this bill. The choice before us today is to keep the government open or close the government. Whether you are Republican or Democrat, if you vote ''no,'' you are voting not to keep the government open. It is that simple.

The other choice before us today is: Do you want to fund the Children's Health Insurance Program for the millions and millions of children and pregnant women across America?

That funding, while we have had emergency extensions, literally is about to run out in a matter of days. It will run out.

The choice tonight for this body and every Member, regardless of party, is: Do you want to fund the Children's Health Insurance Program for children and for pregnant women?

There are 122,700 Oregonians on this program. There are millions across America in our districts. They don't like the fact that we are having this fight, but they know the fact is that it is a ''yes'' or ''no'' vote. That is why the children's hospitals have said: Please take this bill and fund the Children's Health Insurance Program. Take us out of your fight.

What we are voting on tonight is a 6-year fully funded Children's Health Insurance Program. A ''yes'' vote says you are for it. A ''no'' vote says: I will take a pass. Somebody else can carry this program. I am not going to do it.

Well, I am doing it because I support the Children's Health Insurance Program, just as I support the community health centers, just as I support the teaching hospitals, just as I support the other extenders.

By the way, your Energy and Commerce Committee, through regular order, provided a path forward for all of those essential health services. Yes, we took the heavy lift to fund them.

You heard a couple of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about: Oh, they took money out of this fund or took money out of that fund.

The Prevention Fund is funded every year, by law. It is up to the appropriators to decide how those funds are spent.

Using some of the Prevention Fund to fund the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers and the other programs seems like a pretty good investment for an otherwise unallocated batch of money. So we used a bit of that.

Then you heard the scare tactic the Democrats always use: Medicare. Let me tell you what this specific pay-for is. It is one that former President Barack Obama wanted to use even further than what we did.

What we said is: If you are making $500,000 a year, we are going to ask you

to pay roughly $137 more in your Medicare part B and D, which, by the way, is just your share. The government is still going to subsidize 75 percent of that. It is still a very good deal.

We figure that somebody who is making $500,000 a year could afford a little more, so we can pay for community health centers for the poor and the Children's Health Insurance Program for those who need it. That is the pay-for you have heard about.

When we brought the fully funded bill for 5 years for the Children's Health Insurance Program and 2 years for community health centers and save our DSH hospitals—those are the ones, by the way, that take care of the poorest among us—15 Democrats voted with us and I think two or three Republicans voted ''no,'' and we sent that bill to the Senate.

We did our job in this House in a bipartisan way. Now we need to do that job again, because the Senate hasn't acted. They couldn't get enough Democrats there to support the proposal in the Senate. So we are back here.

But the choice is a clear one: shut down the government and don't fund CHIP; or keep the government open and fund CHIP. That is the choice before us tonight that we need to make.

Now, we have heard all kinds of rhetoric on this floor and out in the public about this is somehow a cherry on top of dog doo-doo. Sorry to use those words, but they are the ones that the gentlewoman from San Francisco used in the press. I find it offensive. It is unnecessary. It doesn't help bring us together.

When you vote ''no,'' you vote to shut the government down and you vote against the Children's Health Insurance Program. This bill fully funds the Children's Health Insurance Program for 6 years. There is no argument about the pay-fors now because there aren't any in there.

So if your argument for voting ''no'' was the pay-fors before, what is your argument today, other than a partisan one?

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members of the House to approve this legislation.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are five months in the 2018 fiscal year, yet here we are again getting ready to vote on another short-term government funding bill.

Has this become the norm in the new Republican-led government?

I'd like to point out that this will be the fourth continuing resolution since September.

Our country isn't winning when our military, government agencies, and important federal programs are operating under short-term spending bills.

The American people are tired of the partisanship that has kept Washington from doing its job. They expect results and it's our job to deliver.

It's our job to fund the military and domestic programs, deliver protections for DREAMers, keep our quality community health centers open, reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for those whose districts were impacted by natural disasters, it's our job to pass disaster aid for the families and small businesses that were impacted.

There's broad bipartisan support for all the priorities that I mentioned.

It's my hope that the Republican majority will roll up their sleeves and get to work for the American people.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Continuing Resolution because we must stop kicking the can down the road, and that is all this Countinuing Resolution will do.

The Republican approach to governing has been to pass short term extensions of programs and Continuing Resolutions that merely delay the hard work of making decisions on the big issues facing our country.

This is now the fourth stop-gap Continuing Resolution for Fiscal 2018 that we are being asked to consider. Each time Republicans have said they need more time to deal with this crisis of their own making. And yet each time, they have failed to negotiate with Democrats to make any progress toward the bipartisan budget agreement that we need in order to develop responsible appropriations bills.

Instead, Republicans are again bringing a bill to the floor that fails to address the big challenges our nation faces. This CR does not help Americans recovering from the hurricanes that hit Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Florida, and Texas and the wildfires and mudslides that have ravaged California. It does not fund community health centers that people depend on for their healthcare or help those who need assistance battling opioid addiction. It does not protect those in danger of losing their pensions, and it will not stop our nation from hitting its debt limit.

Republicans have also failed to negotiate in good faith on a solution to the crisis that President Trump himself created for the millions of Dreamers living in this country.

Dreamers are American in every way but their citizenship, and due to the President's actions, more than 16 thousand of them have lost their DACA protections, an average of 122 per day. Tens of thousands more Dreamers will eventually lose their jobs and their protection against deportation if we do not take action.

As the author of the Dream Act in the House, I believe we must act NOW. It is inhumane to force Dreamers to live in fear and uncertainty. They can't afford to wait until the last minute for a solution, as Republicans have done so often while leading Congress.

Governing by repeated CRs is neither governing nor leading. It leaves federal agencies such as our Department of Defense unable to plan for the future or begin new initiatives, which undermines our national security and leaves our homeland more vulnerable. This is not how the appropriations process is supposed to work.

We cannot keep kicking the can down the road. I oppose this CR and urge my colleagues to vote no so we can get the job done now.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Rules Committee Print 115–55, legislation extending the Continuing Resolution now in effect for another month, or until February 16, 2018.

But before I proceed further, I want to note—and Americans needs to know—that this is not a spending bill; it is instead an affirmation of the House Republicans' inability to govern.

This is the fourth time House Republicans have chosen to kick the can down the road rather than work with Democrats to come to a necessary bipartisan agreement to lift the Budget Control Act (BCA) spending caps, giving appropriators the direction they need for full-year funding bills.

The reason given for passing each of the prior Continuing Resolutions was that the extra time was needed to reach a comprehensive agreement to fund government operations in a fair and balanced way.

Yet, even with the extra time, House Republicans made no progress during any of the previous extensions.

This should not be surprising; the House GOP is carrying the water for the president, who a few months ago said ''we need a big beautiful shutdown.''

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support a CR that does not include full funding for disaster recovery, extends additional health access for veterans, provides funding to combat the opioid epidemic, and protects pensions.

Most important, it is outrageous that House Republicans would bring to the floor and request support for a fourth CR extension that does not address and resolve the crisis the Republican Administration has inflicted on 800,000 Dreamers and their families, including 124,000 Dreamers in my home state of Texas.

Instead of acting responsibly to address these issues and fund the government for the remainder of the fiscal year, House Republicans continue wasting time.

This is not appropriations; this is a stop-gap funding measure to save ourselves from collapse.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us includes a six year reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), which provides health coverage to nine million children, and which Republicans allowed to lapse on September 30, 2017.

This is not a meaningful extension.

In contrast, making CHIP permanent would not only provide long-term stability for families, providers, and states, it would save $6 billion according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Republicans are only just now getting around to reauthorizing the program because they wasted months on efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and enact unpaid for tax cuts for the wealthy.

I know firsthand about the important work done through CHIP.

My state is home to the Texas Children's Hospital. Any Republican who believes it is acceptable to play politics with children's health clearly does not appreciate the work done there.

This CR includes additional tax cuts totaling over $26 billion, including a two year delay of the medical device and Cadillac taxes, and a one year delay of the health insurance tax.

At the same time, the resolution fails to address numerous other expired and expiring health priorities, from funding for community health centers to waiving caps on therapy services for seniors on Medicare, to preventing cuts to safety net hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, despite controlling the House, Senate, and the White House, Republicans have not funded the government for the entire year, even though we are already four months into the fiscal year.

Democrats, meanwhile, have done the work with which we were tasked. I am a member of the Budget committee and we Democrats proposed a budget that:

Respected the needs of all Americans, including those who serve bravely in the Department of Defense;

Honored the sacrifice of our heroes in uniform;

Protected programs like CHIP, made investments in infrastructure and ensured that Americans have access to quality healthcare.

Because Republicans refuse to work with Democrats and compromise on how to provide relief from the BCA's sequester level spending caps, they are lurching from CR to CR—degrading the readiness of our military and preventing government agencies from properly serving the American people.

This is not a responsible way to govern; therefore, I cannot support this bill.

House Republicans need to work across the aisle with Democrats and get our work done—including upholding the long-standing precedent of agreeing to parity when providing relief from sequester caps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 696, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1900

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 7 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 2954;

Passage of H.R. 2954, if ordered;

The motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 195 with an amendment;

The motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1660; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

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

HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ADJUSTMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2954) to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 236, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—191

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

NAYS—236

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
Gonzalez (TX)
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)
Jenkins (WV)
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
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
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
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—3

Cummings
Noem
Scalise

□ 1923

Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. RUSSELL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr.

NEWHOUSE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. SMITH of Washington, LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. GARAMENDI changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 184, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—243

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)
Cartwright
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
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)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
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
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
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
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—184

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cummings
Noem
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1930

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 195) to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, with an amendment, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to concur.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 197, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—230

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
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
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
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
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
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
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
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)
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (WI)
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
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—197

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
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
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Bridenstine
Cummings
Noem
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1936

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLOBAL HEALTH INNOVATION 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. 1660) to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency, 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 California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 3, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—423

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
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
Carbajal
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
DeSaulnier
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
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
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)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
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
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
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
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
Shuster
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
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
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 (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—3

Amash
Gohmert
Jones

NOT VOTING—4

Cummings
Noem
Renacci
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1943

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill 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.

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

□ 1945

TAX REFORM DELIVERING FOR AMERICANS

(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, earlier today, I had the honor of being in Pittsburgh with President Trump to hear him speak about how tax reform is putting America back to work. We were at H&K Equipment, a company that is investing in itself at a rate of 50 percent higher than last year thanks to tax reform.

H&K credits the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act for providing them with the ability to expense 100 percent of the investments they make in new construction and demolition equipment. That is tax reform right at work in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Of course, this is in addition to State College's AccuWeather giving year-end bonuses; Malvern's Meridian Bancorp increasing its minimum wage to $15 per hour, with an additional 20 percent added to the 2017 bonuses; Allentown's American Bank giving employees $1,000 bonuses; and Pittsburgh's PNC Financial Services giving $1,000 bonuses to 47,500 of its nationwide employees, while increasing base wages, retirement program contributions, and its charitable giving.

These are just a few stories. Tax reform is working, fair and simple.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GENERAL EDWARD L. ROWNY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the persevering and prescient life of American General Edward L. Rowny, who passed away on December 18 of last year at the age of 100.

Proud of his Polish-American heritage, he attained a century of life in the Polish tradition of Sto lat, dear general. This valiant soul served our Nation under five Presidents, of both parties.

He served under the command of General Douglas MacArthur and rose to be a shining general in his own right, a brave guardian of liberty through courage, sacrifice, expertise, and wisdom.

General Rowny was born the son of a Polish immigrant and a Polish-American mother on April 3, 1917. A West Point graduate, he served in World War II and led a battalion with the 92nd Army Infantry Division, driving up the west coast of Italy.

He remained a dogged ally of then-occupied Poland and the Polish people and advanced the return of the remains of Ignacy Jan Paderewski to Poland in 1992 after the fall of the Berlin Wall 3 years earlier.

He later founded the Rowny Paderewski Scholarship Fund to bring Polish students to the United States to study American democracy. He continued to raise funds for it until his dying day.

General Rowny lived to see solidarity bring freedom to Poland and helped usher Poland into the NATO security alliance.

He was an esteemed arms control adviser under every President from Richard Nixon to George H.W. Bush.

After being a chief negotiator in the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with the former Soviet Union, he was awarded the Presidential Citizens Medal.

General Rowny's life and being was imbued with his long history of fighting for freedom, justice, and democracy, including helping free his ancestral land of Poland. His accomplishments will not be forgotten.

Thank you, General Edward Rowny, for your service to liberty. You have been one of a kind, unceasing in your utter dedication to liberty at its cutting edge.

''Dziekuje bardzo. Bardzo. Bardzo.'' Thank you very much.

AMERICA'S ANGELS ABROAD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Peace Corps volunteers represent what is best about America. They are our angels abroad. They give years of their lives to help other people. They build goodwill across the globe for the United States. But many Peace Corps volunteers don't receive the care that they need both in-country and when they get home.

Peace Corps volunteers struggle to access quality medical treatment when they are abroad in remote areas of the world. When they return to America, they face a red tape bureaucratic nightmare.

Congressman KENNEDY and I have sponsored the Sam Farr Peace Corps Enhancement Act. This act will improve and strengthen the health, safety, and well-being of current and returning Peace Corps volunteers. It requires that Peace Corps volunteers have access to a qualified Peace Corps medical officer overseas. It extends their Peace Corps medical coverage when they return home to America.

America must protect our Peace Corps ambassadors abroad. They are some of America's best.

And that is just the way it is.

WHAT WE DIDN'T DO FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what we did not do today for the American people's enhancement.

What we did not do today is provide for enlisted men and women. We need to increase compensation for their families who are on food stamps. We did nothing for them today.

We did nothing for Rose Escobar and her husband. Her husband was departed to El Salvador, a place where he has never been. They have two children and live in Houston, Texas. We have been pleading for his case to be reviewed. He is a DREAMer. He is DACA-eligible. He was managing a paint store. He was buying a house. We did nothing for him today.

Who else did we not do anything for?

The millions of people who use community health clinics and whose funding will expire. For 25 years, Central Care has been the facility that has served African Americans, Hispanics, and others for fee-for-service and Medicaid. We did absolutely nothing for them.

So we should not be afraid of stopping this government, if we have to do it, because we need to do something for the DREAMers. We need to do something for people who don't have healthcare and have to use federally qualified health centers.

My God, we need to do something for the enlisted men and women whose families are on food stamps and whose salaries are not commensurate with the sacrifice they make.

I am standing, Mr. Speaker, with each and every one of them.

NEW WITHHOLDING TABLES

(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 immediate benefits that H.R. 1, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, is already delivering for American families.

On January 11, the Treasury Department released its updated withholding tables for 2018. These tables work to implement the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the tax reform package passed by Congress and signed into law by President Trump just before Christmas.

With the implementation of these new withholding tables, the Treasury Department has estimated that 90 percent of wage earners will experience an increase in their take-home pay. A married couple with two children, making $75,000 a year, would see a $1,350 wage increase per year.

I am thrilled to see what closing unfair loopholes, simplifying the Tax Code, and getting the Federal Government out of the way does to boost the financial stability of American families.

IMPENDING SHUTDOWN AND DACA

(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 today in the midst of yet another looming government shutdown and an impending nightmare for DREAMers created by those who run Washington.

Republicans control the House, the Senate, and elected the great negotiator in the White House, yet here we are again. It is time they come to the table in good faith to provide our Nation fiscal certainty and lay down their threats against DREAMers in this country, those who were brought here as children and live as upstanding members of communities across our Nation. Our priority should be strengthening American families, not ripping them apart.

Just this week, as we have all seen on the news, ICE officials forcefully deported Jorge Garcia, a 39-year-old man from Michigan with a wife and kids. He has lived in this country almost his entire life and made an honest living after being brought here as a child. He has hardly a parking ticket on his record.

I call on the President and my Republican colleagues to work across the aisle in good faith and lead for the good of our Nation rather than their political base.

CR IMPACTS THE MILITARY

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, last summer, the House passed all 12 appropriations bills before the fiscal year started on October 1.

We appropriated nearly $650 billion to provide our servicemembers with the resources they need to defend this country in the face of threats from North Korea, China, Russia, al-Qaida, ISIS, and Iran. The House funded other Federal programs at nearly $550 billion.

For the past 3½ months, however, our military and servicemembers have been operating under continuing resolutions, also known as CRs, which means they are stuck at the funding levels they had last year. That is because Senate Democrats are holding back the full funding of our defenses so they can add billions of dollars more in other Federal spending.

The defense of this country, Mr. Speaker, is not some bargaining chip, and preventing our servicemembers from getting the resources they need, especially after we have seen servicemember deaths resulting from the lack of training and proper equipment, is unconscionable.

As Secretary Mattis told us last year: ''Long-term CRs impact the readiness of our forces and their equipment at a time when security threats are extraordinarily high. The longer the CR, the greater the consequences for our force.''

It is way past time for Senate Democrats to end their filibustering of our Nation's defense and to start helping our servicemembers in harm's way.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DENISE BURDITUS

(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 Denise Burditus.

Denise was a mother of two and a grandmother of three. She was looking forward to the birth of her fourth grandchild. She had recently left her job, after 30 years of working at a bank, so she could return to school and spend more time with her grandchildren.

She went to the Route 91 Harvest music festival in Las Vegas with her high school sweetheart and husband of 32 years, Tony Burditus.

Denise is remembered by her friends and family for being full of life, for always being positive, and for her devotion to her family.

I extend my condolences to Denise Burditus' family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

□ 2000

HONORING KATHLEEN JIMINO ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

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

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I rise today to recognize and celebrate the career of Mrs. Kathleen Jimino on the occasion of her retirement as Rensselaer County executive. Kathy has retired after 16 years of dedicated service to the people of Rensselaer County.

Throughout her tenure as county executive, Kathy was a driving force for economic growth and fiscal solvency in Rensselaer County, actively responding to the needs of her constituency in an effective and resourceful manner.

In addition to the time as county executive, I am grateful for the many years Kathy spent loyally serving the people of New York State and the city of Troy.

Kathy has been an esteemed leader of the community, and I thank her for her commitment to New York's 19th Congressional District. I wish Kathy and her husband, Vince, every happiness as they embark upon this new chapter in their lives.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, my grandfather spent 4 years in jail during Gandhi's independence movement standing for human rights. One of his crimes was expressing unpopular views in a political newspaper.

Similar human rights abuses are occurring today in Vietnam. I speak out, today, for those who have been silenced. In many cases, the victims are the brother, the sister, the friend, or acquaintance of someone living in my district.

Over 100 activists and religious leaders are currently imprisoned in Vietnam for expressing their opinions and beliefs. For example, social activist and blogger Nguyen Ngoc Nhu Quynh was recently sentenced to 10 years in prison for highlighting social injustices on her blog.

In California's 17th District, I am proud of organizations like The Good Will Brother-Sister Group that stand in solidarity for their oppressed friends and family in Vietnam.

The Vietnamese Government must release every political prisoner, stop harassing religious groups, and have the confidence in allowing a free press. Until they do that, we must do no business deals with Vietnam and make it clear that we expect them to honor human rights.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN DOUG BARNARD

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a legend who represented the great people of Augusta, Georgia, for 16 years, in, yes, the United States House of Representatives.

Last week, former Congressman Doug Barnard, Jr., passed away at the age of 95 in his beloved hometown.

Although Congressman Barnard served at a very different time in our Nation's history, many of the issues discussed then are the same that we are talking about today, like tax reform, immigration reform, and financial regulatory reform.

A World War II veteran, a lawyer, and a banker, Congressman Barnard made his mark as a well-respected leader of the House Banking Committee. He was willing to work across the aisle to do what was best for the people of Augusta and all Americans.

I was very pleased that Doug introduced and offered his support to me when I made my announcement to run for Congress. Over the years, I have sought his advice, and I have always cherished his mentorship.

Doug Barnard was a great man of faith, a friend, and a statesman. He will always be remembered and will be sorely missed—not only by me, but the entire Augusta community.

RUSSIAN TRANSPARENCY

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, as many of you know, we have had a Russian narrative that has been going on because of an infamous dossier. While there has been much reported on it, I can tell you that the Intelligence Committee has been fast at work, and Chairman NUNES has been doing outstanding work to get to the truth for the American people.

Today, I had the opportunity to go into a confidential setting to make sure that what we can do is understand better what actually took place. I am here to tell all of America tonight that I am shocked to read exactly what has taken place. I would think that it would never happen in a country that loves freedom and democracy like this country.

It is time that we become transparent in all of this. I am calling on our leadership to make this available so that all Americans can judge for themselves.

CHINA'S STRATEGY TO ACCRUE GLOBAL POWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) is recognized for 57 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOHO. 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 the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I chair the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs. I have been in Congress for 5 years, and what I have noticed over the last, probably, 30 years is a growing China. China is a culture that has been around for thousands of years. What we have seen is a growing China, but, more recently, in the last 25 years, a more aggressive China, in the policies and the different things that they do around the world.

Twenty-eight years ago, Deng Xiaoping announced that China's strategy to accrue global power would be to ''hide one's strength and bide one's time.'' As I rise, today, in the House, this evening, it is clear that China is done biding its time.

I can remember seeing a documentary several years ago from 1986, where that leader, Deng Xiaoping, talked about that he could not compete with the U.S. or the Japanese in the intellectual property, computer manufacturing, or in IT.

What they said at that time was that they will compete by taking over the rare earth metals that are required in all of that. So, from that point forward, they led that charge to strategically set out a 100-year plan.

At China's 19th National Congress of the Communist Party of China last October 2017, Xi Jinping announced a new era, in which China has started to overcome the humiliations of colonialism and that it has stood up, grown rich, and is becoming strong.

We talked about this. It came out in a meeting. Somebody brought up that, through their whole adult life, China was just kind of this big, stumbling child. But they had reached a point and grown through puberty, where the hormones had kicked in, and they found out how strong they were. Then they discovered how rich they were, and they started to flex both of those.

He explicitly offered the Chinese model as an alternative to liberal democracy. Liberal democracy, that is what the Western world and the United States rests on: allowing people to be self-determining, allowing people to be free-thinking, allowing people to be empowered. This is something that is to the antithesis of the Chinese doctrine, stating that ''the banner of socialism with Chinese characteristics is now flying high and proud for all to see,'' offering ''a new option for other countries and nations.''

Mr. Speaker, as the new year begins, we must decide how we want to craft policy and legislation that will address not just Xi Jinping's so-called new era, and China's. I say that we should welcome China's effort to assume its rightful place on the world stage. But we must also reject China's efforts to undermine the values, institutions, and rules that generations of Americans have died for, along with other countries, to establish and uphold. We must never allow a socialist, authoritarian model of government, to supplant the primacy of democracy, no matter how rich and how strong the authoritarians become.

China is not choosing to rise through the global order that the United States and our allies have built with our blood and our sweat—a global order made up of the international institutions that have held the peace since World War II; of the competitive and rules-based economic playing field; and of a free marketplace of ideas where people, not governments, decide what they will think.

Instead, China has grown to become a revisionist power—not rising within the current order, but seeking to change, subvert, or coerce it to suit China's end—not playing by the rules, but rewriting the rules to suit the needs of China.

China's foreign policy is rewriting the rules in three key areas:

First, China is replacing traditional soft power, which is based on a nation's attractiveness, with ''sharp power,'' which leverages coerciveness. The scale is astounding. China has used sharp power to buy political influence in Australia, academic influence on American campuses, and even bought off Panama's diplomatic alliance with Taiwan. The National Endowment for Democracy, which coined the term ''sharp power,'' has exhaustively documented China's efforts to turn Latin America elites into ''de facto ambassadors of the Chinese cause''—right in our own backyard.

The world will not tolerate these coercive influence operations. Last month, Prime Minister Turnbull of Australia captured this indignation best when he used Mandarin to play on a classic Mao Zedong quote, ''the Chinese people have stood up.'' Turnbull said that ''the Australian people stand up.'' Congress must, likewise, ensure that the American people stand up to coercion in our politics, academia, and culture.

Second, China is rewriting the rules of engagement by using gray zone tactics that erode the distinction between peace and conflict. In the South China Sea, China has used what it has referred to as ''salami slicing'' to gradually attain its military objectives without provoking a confrontation, undermining the international mechanisms that are supposed to decide territorial disputes. It goes back to the saying of Deng Xiaoping: ''Hide one's strength and bide one's time.''

As I said, I chair the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, and at one of our hearings last year, one witness testified that ''by slowly changing the situation on the ground, China hopes to transform 'Asia Mediterranean' into a Chinese lake.''

We can't keep standing idly by while China does these things. Xi Jinping once stood next to President Obama at the White House and pledged that he would not militarize the South China Sea.

As an aside, I was at a hearing. We were there with one of the representatives of the Chinese Government. They were talking about how everything they have done in the South China Sea was for peaceful navigational purposes. I brought up that I wish I could feel the love, or I wish I could feel the sincerity

of that, because our military satellites showed a 10,000-foot runway, our military satellites showed military barracks, our satellites showed both offensive and defensive weapons, radar systems. Yes, there was a lighthouse, but I didn't see a resort on there that showed peaceful navigational purposes.

Then he built a network of air bases, missile emplacements, radars, and ports that we had seen. Four thousand acres of the South China Sea that were dredged, destroying the environment—coral reefs—and they put in this today, which is militarized, and they don't hide it. We should look to India's example rather than accept further lies. A little resistance to China's encroachment along their disputed border has prevented the same ''salami slicing'' from happening on land.

And, thirdly, China is rewriting the rules of trade and economics. At a hearing before my subcommittee last year, one witness warned that ''China has doubled down on its unfair, mercantilist strategies, and is now seeking global dominance in a wide array of advanced industries that are key to U.S. economic and national security interests.'' These zero-sum policies benefit China's domestic champions at the expense of fairness and competition in global trade.

At home, China wields its massive market as a blunt instrument, forcing foreign companies to divulge what it wants without giving them a chance to compete. Abroad, China is acquiring or stealing the industries of tomorrow, unfairly boosting its domestic innovation and hollowing out our competitors. Throughout the developing world, China has undertaken a massive infrastructure program that exports surplus industrial capacity and aligns closely with military interests.

In 2018, the United States must stand up to China's revisionism in these three key areas: sharp power influence operations, gray zone warfare, and mercantilist economics.

Some important policy steps have already begun. For example, Congressman PITTENGER has introduced legislation in the House to improve CFIUS, which is a review, and the Treasury Department has undertaken a section number, called 301 investigation into China's innovation of mercantilism.

□ 2015

These actions will help protect the future of the U.S. economy. This is a warning sign that we have seen that we must rise up to and counteract, but more must be done.

We have to blunt China's sharp power in the United States by countering Confucius institutes at schools and propaganda outlets in our cities that spread communist propaganda. We have to respond to the malicious state-sponsored activity in shared domains like the cyber realm. We have to modernize our international development work to compete with China in the developing world.

This year I will be introducing legislation to accomplish these goals, and I hope my colleagues will join me in this important work.

We must also remember that standing up for American interests means standing up for our values. Xi Jinping's leadership has turned to creeping totalitarianism. He is building an unprecedented surveillance state, increasing the communist party's ideological control of society and the reconciliation of the party's authority over every aspect of life. Human rights and civil liberties in China is worsening, and Xi Jinping must be held accountable.

In the year ahead, I hope all of my colleagues would join me in standing up for America's interests and values, and resisting China's revisionism.

After the 19th Congress, the Communist Party Congress, Xi Jinping stood up and said the era of China has arrived. No longer would China be made or forced to swallow their interests around the world, nor should they, but he also said the era of China has arrived and it is time to take the center stage.

That is a threat, and not acceptable, I don't think, to the American people. It sounds like it is a warning that they are going to throw us off the stage. However, talking to people in the administration and the rest of the world, I think we would be willing to share the stage, but to think that they are going to supplant every other country is not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who used to be the chair of the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee, and who has brought up some important legislation on this topic that we are talking about tonight.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also thank him for pulling together this Special Order here this evening.

As the gentleman mentioned, I used to be the chair of the subcommittee that he now chairs, and that is the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. I have been on the Foreign Affairs Committee for over 20 years now. We do a lot of important things on that committee, and our view of China has evolved somewhat over that time.

Do we want to have good relations with China?

Absolutely. It is in our best interests, it is in China's best interests, it is in the world's best interests. We passed normal trade relations some years ago. It used to be called the most favored nation; now it is normal trade relations. We trade with them a lot.

Many would argue that American jobs have gone to China. They have stolen our technology, our intellectual property secrets, and a whole range of other things. So they haven't been terribly cooperative in that area, yet they have benefited a great deal.

One of our strongest allies, Taiwan, the PRC—China—has been bullying for years. Too often, China has gotten their way. They have been able to keep Taiwan out of international health organizations that would be helped by having the Taiwanese expertise in that. They have done a whole range of things.

When I first came here, there were several hundred missiles in the PRC—China—pointed at Taiwan. Now there are over 1,600 missiles, and they threaten them on a whole range of things. So it is very important that we continue to have strong relations with Taiwan.

Legislation that I have proposed and that we have passed here before in our committee and that we hope to pass in the House as well—and then we hope the Senate will take it up as well—is to allow high-ranking Taiwanese officials to come here to the United States, particularly to Washington, D.C., to meet with our officials here in our Nation's Capital. That makes sense, and hopefully we will do that in the very near future, but China has been very uncooperative, obviously, with respect to Taiwan.

They have been particularly uncooperative with respect to one of our greatest threats in the world right now, and that is North Korea. We get a lot of lip service from China, but very little action.

North Korea is a threat. For a long time, they were a threat to the region. We cared about that and we worked with our allies on that. But now they are a threat to Washington, D.C., and Seattle and Los Angeles and my home city, Cincinnati, and cities all over the United States, because we believe they can now reach the United States with nuclear weapons.

That is the first time. A lot of us were concerned about that day ever coming. Previous administrations tried to get China to lean on North Korea because China has the greatest clout with North Korea because China provides most of their food and most of their fuel. About 90 percent of North Korea's trade is with China. China acts like they are going to be helpful, and then they are not.

The last thing we want to see is military confrontation. You will have some folks in our country that that is their principal priority, they don't want any confrontation, but then they will be satisfied to have North Korea have nuclear weapons.

We can't tolerate somebody as unpredictable, somebody as dangerous as Kim Jong-un or his predecessors, his father or grandfather, people like that to have nuclear weapons. It is just unacceptable to the United States and most other countries around the world, but the rest of the world looks to us to act.

This is a case where we really do need China to step up and do the right thing. Thus far, they have not been willing to do that.

So the question is: How do we get China to do that?

In the past, a number of us thought the way you got China's attention was

to at least discuss with our allies in the region—South Korea, Japan, even Taiwan, perhaps—to consider having nuclear weapon programs themselves. And maybe even talking about that would be off-putting enough to the PRC that they would lean on North Korea to back off their program.

Well, we are probably beyond that now because North Korea not only has a nuclear program, but they have one that could now hit the continental United States.

I think the only thing at this point that works is any leverage that we have with China itself, that if they don't act, then they can either trade with North Korea or they can trade with us. That ought to be a pretty easy deal for them to make. The economy in North Korea is in shambles. The people are starving. The people are repressed by their own illegitimate government. So there is not a lot of trade. It is not of great import to China. In fact, their relationship with North Korea—I think the way they look at it—it keeps us off balance. So they can trade with North Korea or they can trade with us.

Now, trade with the United States is very significant to the PRC. It means millions and millions and millions of jobs.

Are we willing to go that far?

Well, I think we should be when you are considering war, which is the alternative to actually getting North Korea to back off their program.

So in this case, I think we ought to make it clear to China that we are serious about this; whether it is the financial system, international banking, cutting that off. We ought to fully cut that off with North Korea and at least on the books we have, but China has ways of getting around that and propping up their ally, North Korea.

So this is the time. It has got to happen soon. North Korea has, we think, probably 20 or so nuclear devices at this point. You wait another year or 2 years, they are going to have dozens and dozens and dozens of them.

Not only is that dangerous because they have them, but it is dangerous because they will sell those nuclear devices to organizations, al-Qaida, perhaps even ISIS, or other organizations that would love to smuggle those things into this country and use them. They would use them in a heartbeat if they had them. We can't let that happen.

So things that we talked about in previous administrations and that administrations would negotiate—we had six-party agreements and we would get together—and North Korea would agree:

> Okay. For food and fuel, we will end our nuclear program.

On the books it was ended, but underground or in the mountains, it was continuing.

Both previous Republican and Democratic administrations essentially let that happen, and it was bad, but they couldn't reach the United States. Now they can reach the United States.

So we are at that time now that years ago we warned about. We are there now. So I would strongly encourage this administration to take this seriously and do whatever is possible, short of war—we want to avoid that if at all possible—to make sure that China finally leans on North Korea to back down.

Mr. Speaker, I thank again the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), who is doing a fine job as chair of the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee. I also thank him for the opportunity and pulling this together this evening.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the kind words, and I look to follow in his footsteps.

I want to also give a shout-out that the first version of the six assurances, Mr. CHABOT introduced to Congress on October 28, 2015, what the six assurances were proposed to be, and we will read those later on.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE). Judge POE has been a strong supporter of the whole Asia-Pacific region and he has got some wise words that I think we all can learn from.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the gentleman holding the Special Order on China.

It is important that Americans know who the Chinese are, what they are up to, and what their plans are in the future.

We will start with North Korea. No question about it: China could rein in North Korea and little Kim if China wanted to. They don't want to. That is why he is a menace to not only that region, but to the rest of the world. But China could rein in little Kim. They are storing millions—maybe billions—of dollars in assets in China. They could freeze those assets. They could cut off trade with North Korea.

China must understand that it is in their interest that North Korea not get nuclear weapons; not necessarily our interest, but their interest. When they come to that realization—which I think it is in their interest that North Korea be reined in to make sure that they don't use nuclear weapons or continue to develop nuclear weapons or use weapons against any of their neighbors—then North Korea will cease its belligerent activities.

The key lies with Beijing. If they make that decision, the world will be safer. If they don't make that decision, the world and Beijing will not be safer either.

Also, I want to point out kind of their philosophy, why they act the way they do.

Beijing has, first of all, little regard for the lives of the millions of Chinese citizens. China's communist regime shares more values with the communist North Korea than it does the U.S.

For decades, Beijing's human rights record has been among the worst in the whole world. It has persecuted not thousands, but millions of people who are not followers of communism and Maoism.

Mr. Speaker, remember, communism—because China is a communist nation, although it is not really politically correct to say that much anymore, they are a communist nation that teaches against God, and their God is the state and tells the people you have to worship the state.

So when you have an atheistic regime in charge, you can see why they persecute their own people and torture not only Christians and Muslims, but Tibetans and other people who don't agree with their atheistic philosophy.

We need to be sure, as a country built on religious freedom, that we call China out for its abuse and persecution of its own people. I know we trade with the Chinese. They are a big trading partner. I don't think trade and money ought to get in the way of calling China out for abusing the people who live in China and abusing their rights of religious freedom. We can't turn a blind eye to that merely because we trade with them as a major trading partner.

We have learned through history that regimes that oppress their own people just seem to have ambitions beyond their own borders and subjugate those people as well.

□ 2030

The South China Sea, most Americans probably don't even know where that is. South China Sea is an area, it is a trading lane, navigation lane. It has been a trading area.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of this Special Order is to draw attention to what China is doing, and I think, as Mr. CHABOT brought up, we are not against China. It is the practices that they are doing that we need to make sure that the American people know, the American people know what is going on, the amount of theft that we see, intellectual property, that costs the American taxpayers between $300 billion and $600 billion.

I have been at expos held by the Department of Homeland Security where they have counterfeit products that come from American manufacturers that are in China on goodwill, good faith efforts to create a good product, to create jobs in China, but yet that product winds up being counterfeited by Chinese companies that we think the Chinese Government—and we have evidence that they are complicit in it. They are selling products against our own competition, our own manufacturers in this country, and it is eroding the American economy, and China gains from this. This is a practice that has to be stopped, and we have to stop allowing this to happen.

One of the other things, if we look back over history, in the 1840s, there were the opium wars between the United Kingdom and China. A lot of opium and drugs flowed into China, and it hurt the Chinese population. At one

point, 90 percent of the males in China were hooked on opium.

Yet today, in the 21st century, we are seeing the reverse of that, and we are seeing narcotics flow from China, or precursors of synthetic opioids flow into Central America, to Mexico, to come into our borders. There is no medicinal use for fentanyl other than pain control, or heroin. Heroin has no medicinal use, very limited.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN), who, in the last Congress, introduced the Comprehensive Fentanyl Control Act to combat illegal fentanyl, a synthetic opioid, coming from China.

Not only do they send the precursors, they send the presses to create the pills into these other countries. Again, it does not serve us or the American people or our economy at all.

If you are a trading partner and you want to go by the rule of law and you want to, hopefully, in trade, do what is best for your country, but you also want to have a benefit for your trading partner, this is a one-way street, and it is going to have to end.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to demand action from our Chinese counterparts in targeting fentanyl traffickers. This poison is 50 times more powerful than heroin and is responsible for thousands of American deaths.

Street dealers import fentanyl from China and then mix it with heroin and deal it on unsuspecting users in packages stamped with names such as ''Pray for Death.'' That product was confiscated in my hometown yesterday in Staten Island.

These mixes of deadly substances is why, as the gentleman mentioned, I introduced the Comprehensive Fentanyl Control Act, asking our country to prohibit the online sale of presses in which fentanyl is pressed into these imitation tablets that unsuspecting users will take, unknowing that fentanyl is part of that pill.

Fentanyl is dangerous even to our authorities. Police officers, firefighters, first responders have overdosed from contact with fentanyl during drug busts. I have spoken to far too many families who have lost sons and daughters, first as the district attorney of Staten Island and now as a Congressman.

The Chinese Government, as my colleagues have said, tries to control their own citizens. Well, now it is about time they control the fentanyl that is coming out of their country.

This past fall, President Trump extracted promises that the Chinese would curb their export of fentanyl. Now it is time for the Chinese to take action.

I thank the gentleman from Florida for his leadership in this area. I thank him for yielding to me to discuss this important matter to every part of our country. No one is immune from it.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work that the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN) has done with the Comprehensive Fentanyl Control Act to combat illegal fentanyl. I thank him for his participation, being on the committee, and his passion for what he is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), a good friend of mine and a good Member of Congress, to add to this discussion.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), my good friend. I appreciate his work on this and for calling this Special Order together tonight.

Once again, it is the time of year where I have the somber privilege to come to the floor and extend happy birthday wishes to Chinese human rights defender and prisoner of conscience, Zhu Yufu.

What should be an occasion for celebration remains marred by the fact that, on February 13, Zhu Yufu will spend his 65th birthday in a Chinese prison. This will mark his seventh consecutive birthday behind bars, another birthday separated from his family and children.

Although isolated, Zhu is certainly not forgotten. He has been a fervent champion for human rights in China for decades. He gives voice to a very fundamental and foundational principle: all people everywhere should have the basic freedom to determine the course of their lives and express themselves according to their convictions without fear of government repression. For living out that conviction, he languishes in a Chinese prison in poor health and with irregular access to medical care.

Stifling voices like Zhu's does not silence their cry nor weaken their cause. On the contrary, it shines a light on their plight and renews and strengthens the effort to end repression and injustice in China, as well as in other places around the world.

As long as Zhu Yufu remains incarcerated, I will continue to call upon the Chinese Government to provide him with sufficient food, care, and medical attention, and I will continue to call on the Chinese Government to release Zhu Yufu from prison.

In honor of Zhu Yufu, I would like to read a short poem that he wrote, and it was this poem that led to his arrest and imprisonment. I quote from his poem:

> It's time, people of China! It's time. The Square belongs to everyone. With your own two feet, it's time to head to the Square and make your choice. It's time, people of China! It's time.
>
> A song belongs to everyone. From your own throat. It's time to voice the song in your heart. It's time, people of China! It's time. China belongs to everyone. Of your own will, it's time to choose what China shall be.

Zhu, you are not forgotten. Happy birthday, and may God grant you the strength and His presence and the hope that you will celebrate your next birthday in freedom.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks by Mr. HULTGREN. He did a great job, and I hope that guy gets released.

The gentleman brought up a very good point, and this is something I have noticed. I am so blessed, and I know we are so blessed to live in this great country of ours. Our Founders got it right. I don't know how they did other than divine intervention, that our rights come from a Creator, not from government. Government is instituted by we the people to protect our God-given rights and our core values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our government is a government that empowers the people. Empowered people do great things. In the 19th Congress, it was said—the Chinese Government has set up a Chinese United Front, which is to show soft power in the world instead of doing the things they have done, where they go into a country, put up infrastructure, suck out the resources, and leave and don't care. So they have changed their tactics. They have gotten smart, and they started the Chinese United Front.

But in that communique that they said, it said that the role of the citizens of China is to serve the Government of China. It is the antithesis of what we stand for, and that is why I feel confident in our form of government because we believe in the people. We believe in the greatness of people.

The greatest resource a country has is not their gold, their timber, or any of that other stuff; it is the people. And our country values that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT), a good friend of mine, a passionate speaker on China who sits on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is humbling to have the opportunity to stand in this Chamber to speak on so important a subject as China's role in the world in 2018.

Having had the privilege also of leading American soldiers on foreign soil, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the last resort in any circumstance should be military action, and so I wish to make clear that the strong words that will follow are not directed to be a threat to the People's Republic of China but, instead, to be encouragement to the people thereof.

We want peace and to work alongside all nations in a community of nations, but it is our duty, as free people, to express the basic rights inherent to our very existence in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Chinese people today that we still hold these truths to be self-evident, that all people are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—this message directed, again, to the people of China because the oppressive Communist, dictatorial regime seems hell-bent upon denying these very rights not to nations across the world aside from China, but to the

very people whom they purport to serve; and in so doing, they not only oppress those people, but also perpetrate schemes that lead to a lower quality of life and enhanced threats to people across the globe.

Industrial espionage costs the very livelihoods and well-being of workers in every continent of the world. Intellectual property theft isn't about the hundreds of billions of dollars stolen from those who had the wherewithal, energy, and vision to create, but about the child who won't have an opportunity to attend college because the job that his or her parent might have had has been quite literally stolen by Chinese malfeasance.

Propping up a regime in North Korea that literally engages, in the year 2018, in the enslavement of their own citizens and turning a blind eye on those practices, which, Mr. Speaker, I suppose shouldn't be a surprise when you look at the human rights record of the People's Republic of China itself, I don't have time, nor do my colleagues, though I commend Congressman YOHO for this hour, to recount the number of victims of human rights violations, of prisoners of conscience, of victims of state oppression, of those who had the temerity to stand up and suggest that individuals have certain basic fundamental human rights only to reap horrific consequences underneath a totalitarian Communist regime in the People's Republic of China.

But in the limited time that I have, forced abortions of human life, to the tune of tens and tens and tens of millions; Mr. Speaker, child labor laws drafted by the People's Republic of China that look wonderful on the global stage, but practices that one recent survey indicated would have the entire population of the State of Ohio worth of 10- to 14-year olds working what one recent news story characterized as 16 hours a day, 28 days a month in 2018.

Their laws indicate that they have ended the practice of organ harvesting, and yet mathematical data indicates that, in China, if you are part of the ruling class, it is not hard to find that kidney, that bone marrow, that heart.

This sort of oppression is foisted upon the people of China, while all too often the United States and other nations of the world turn a blind eye not in the interest of respecting cultural differences, but in the interest of our pocketbooks.

□ 2045

We still hold these truths to be self-evident. And if I could do nothing else while I am here, Mr. Speaker, but to speak and encourage nations of the world, but, more importantly, the people oppressed by regimes such as that of the Chinese dictatorial, Communist, totalitarian state, and tell them that we understand, we have their backs, they have our support, then I will have accomplished something.

I am of an age, Mr. Speaker, when one of the images permanently seared in my memory is of a lone man standing in Tiananmen Square facing down a main battle tank. And when I think of that image and then I think of the United States, I think of Patrick Henry, who not only said, ''Give me liberty or give me death,'' but also said, when someone yelled from the back of the room, ''Treason,'' ''If this be treason, make the most of it.''

I think of a 16-year-old girl in Farmville, Virginia, Barbara Johns, whose family had to move because she had the temerity, after discussing the Declaration of Independence with her uncle Vernon Johns, to question why there was a school that only White kids could attend.

And I think of the charge in the Constitution of the United States not to be a perfect Union, because we are not there yet, but to be a more perfect Union.

So then I contemplate my responsibility not only as a Member of this body, and it is obviously to serve the constituents of the Fifth District of Virginia in the United States of America, but also to stand up for human beings across the globe.

And China, we still hold these truths to be self-evident. We will not turn a blind eye on policies that lead to forced abortions of living humans, that lead to child labor policies of 16 hours of work a day, 28 days a month of a number of kids between the ages of 10 and 14 that mirrors the population of the State of Ohio.

We will not turn a blind eye to policies and public statements saying you have ended organ harvesting when all data indicates that you haven't. And then we will not turn a blind eye to the oppression of any minority, and particularly religious minorities, whether it is Falun Gong or Christians or Muslims in the west of China.

So I know in this age of the internet, this age of the world wide web and global communication, that the people of China, though their government seeks to inhibit the flow of information, will hear this, and the message is simple: You are my brothers and sisters. You are human beings just like us. You have the same rights that we have. You will not be given these rights by a government but by a creator or by nature, depending on your belief structure. And if you have the courage to stand up, understand this: We will support you.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and if he wants to participate in a colloquy back and forth, we have a few more minutes. But I want to touch on some issues that I think we need to draw out again. I want the American people to understand what is going on.

When you buy something that says ''made in China,'' I want you to understand what is happening. China has gone from where they were in the 1970s and the 1960s. Richard Nixon went over there, kind of normalized relationships in 1972.

We had a relationship with Taiwan prior to that. I don't want to go into the history of the war between the KMT and Chiang Kai-shek back in the 1940s, but there was a relationship we had with Taiwan. We had a relationship with Great Britain on Hong Kong, and here we are in the 21st century.

Things have changed. Now we have got North Korea on the stage. It is a different world than what it was. We had some longstanding traditions that we stood by as a nation, and people respected that, and then I look at the trade imbalance that we have with China.

Here is a country that Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger in 1971 and 1972 opened up the trade that we have today, that has led to what we have today. And China has done great, and they ought to be applauded for what they have done. They have raised a lot of people out of poverty. But at what expense?

When I look at what is going on in the South China Sea, taking islands that were just coral reefs right under the top of the sea, and they have reclaimed over 4,000 acres—probably the largest ecological disaster and insult to the environment that the world has ever seen—the world stood idly by.

One country, Vietnam, stood up, took them to the court in The Hague, the tribunals. The tribunal ruled against China, and again, the world stood by, did nothing.

The previous administration had a policy of strategic patience. The profession I come from, the veterinary profession, we call that benign neglect. That is where you have a disease that is not life-threatening and you hope it goes away if you ignore it.

But what was going on in the South China Sea could not be handled with benign neglect. What happened is China militarized the islands that they built, even though they said they wouldn't.

And if we look at the other things they said they would help us on with North Korea, China has the biggest influence with North Korea of anybody else. Ninety percent of the trade of North Korea goes through China. China says they are there with us, but yet we know fuel is going in there, coal is going in there. They are trading with them.

In addition, they are complicit in allowing other companies to have shell companies that keep the Kim Jong-un regime afloat developing nuclear weapons. They have a hand in bringing this to a close.

I look at the trade deficit we have with China. It is over $350 billion. Add to that the intellectual property theft, over $350 billion, some people say up to $600 billion. And China says: We are going to get it under control. But just last month they had a trade deficit of over $60 billion.

I want to pose a question to the American people: Do you want a trading partner that is doing these things?

They flood our borders with illegal drugs, as you heard Mr. DONOVAN talk about. They erode our culture. They kill our citizens. They break down our culture. Do you want a trading partner that steals the intellectual property at the cost of American entrepreneurship, American intellectual property, and American jobs?

Do you want a partner that does not honor their word when they said they are going to do something? You talk to other countries around the world and they say: We like doing business with America because you have a rule of law and you will follow it. China does not.

They have halfheartedly agreed to help us with North Korea. And so when you go into a department store and you buy cheap as far as cost and it says ''China'' on it, ''made in China,'' I want people to think: What are you selling? What are you buying, and what are you giving away for your future generation—not just of your kids, but for the posterity of this Nation?

And I would like to get Mr. GARRETT's response on that or anything else he wants to add as an afterthought here.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would just, again, commend the Member from Florida, Congressman YOHO, as it relates to this opportunity.

I think it is important to remember that, just like Americans, whether it was the Revolutionary War or the civil rights movement, the Chinese people have bled. They have sweated. They have paid the price for the basic human rights that we all enjoy here.

And again, I would commend the American consumer to consider the reality of child labor, of exploitative policies as relates to industrial espionage, of exploitative policies that literally deprive Americans of livelihoods perpetrated by the Chinese, and to shop with that in mind until we see real reform from China.

I have been frustrated heretofore with the efforts sometimes of our very own government as it relates to putting any force or its proverbial money where its mouth was to this end, but I believe there is power in the people of the United States.

And so I would encourage people, again, to shop with their consciences until we see actual acts beyond words from a regime that has a history of saying and doing all the right things in public but allowing the perpetuation of horrific, horrific circumstances on their very people at home, in private.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I need to make a correction. I said it was Vietnam that took China to court. It was the Philippines.

But along these lines that you were just talking about, when you look at the word of a nation, the integrity of a nation, I think of Hong Kong. Great Britain and China came to an agreement in 1996, 1997 that Hong Kong would revert back to China.

There was a 50-year agreement that China was to allow them to have self-rule, the rule of law, self-determining, their own government, the right to choose that. Twenty years into this, China has got a strong influence. The freedom in Hong Kong is going backwards.

If we look at the Tibetan people, the Tibetan are probably one of the most peaceful populations on Earth, but yet I can't travel there as a U.S. dignitary or as a U.S. Member of Congress. They can't come here and be recognized. The Dalai Lama can't come here and be recognized because China gets mad. Beijing gets mad.

The Tibetan people have a way to pass on the Dalai Lama to the next generation. China kidnapped the Panchen child and said: We will replace it with who we think should be the next leader, and it is somebody they are going to groom.

And I look at our country, being a Christian. That would be like one of the kings of the Old Testament going in and stealing the baby Jesus and saying: Well, we will put in who we think should be the leader of Christianity.

It is ludicrous what is going on.

And then I think of Taiwan. Taiwan is our 10th largest trading partner, and we have had an agreement since before Richard Nixon. But during Richard Nixon's time, there have been three communiques that talked about how we were going to deal with Taiwan.

And I just want to reiterate the six assurances that Ronald Reagan and STEVE CHABOT talked about, and they are:

Number one, we did not agree to set a date certain for ending arms sales to Taiwan. Robert Gates talked about this in his book, ''Duty.'' We had had this agreement for years, and during that time, about 2012, we were having our arms sales agreement with Taiwan. China raised holy heck about this, and our negotiators said: What is your problem? We have been doing this since the 1970s?

China's response was this, and I think this sets the tone for the future: Back then, we were weak. We are strong now.

I think that speaks loudly of China's intention.

Number two, we see no mediation role of the United States between Taiwan and the PRC.

Number three, nor will we attempt to exert pressure on Taiwan to enter into negotiations with the PRC.

Number four, there has been no change in our longstanding position on the issue of sovereignty over Taiwan.

Number five, we have no plans to seek revision of the Taiwan Relations Act.

And number six, the August 17 communique should not be read to imply that we have agreed to engage prior consultations with Beijing on arms sales to Taiwan. And we tend to stay with that in this administration.

So with that, does the gentleman from Virginia have any closing remarks?

Mr. Speaker, I am ready to close.

I thank everybody for their participation, and I want the American people, again, when you look at something that says ''made in China,'' how is that affecting the future of America?

And nothing against China. If they play fair, they play by the rules, we wish them the best of luck, but we will not be supplanted from our role in the free world.

And again, I feel confident about where America will be 100 years from now because we believe in our people, we empower our people, and we have a government that will stand and protect our constitutional rights that come from a creator.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern over China's worsening human rights record, a clear indicator of its increasing authoritarianism.

With the consolidation in power of President Xi Jinping, the Chinese authorities are making it more and more evident that they will not tolerate any internal dissent or opposition to their rule.

I am not talking about armed opposition, but about loyal opposition—the kind of opposition that takes China's constitution, its laws, and its international human rights obligations at face value.

On July 1, 1997, Britain transferred sovereignty over Hong Kong to China. Under a ''one country, two systems'' arrangement with London, Beijing promised to allow universal suffrage as an ''ultimate aim,'' along with other freedoms.

Yesterday a Hong Kong court jailed democracy activist Joshua Wong for three months for blocking clearance of a protest site, his second prison sentence related to the Umbrella Movement's pro-democracy protests in 2014.

Joshua was the public face of the Umbrella Movement, which called for free elections for Hong Kong's leadership in the framework of the ''one country, two systems'' agreement. He had already been on bail pending the appeal of a separate six-month sentence for unlawful assembly. This time around the judge made clear that he was making an example of him because of his leadership role.

His fellow activist Raphael Wong was sentenced to four and a half months, and several other activists received suspended sentences.

What's notable about this story is that after the protests, Joshua and Raphael went on to run for seats in the Hong Kong parliament. They didn't radicalize or take up arms. They stood up for their principles. And now they're in jail.

I have often stood on the floor of this House to call for respect for the human rights of the Tibetan people in China.

Just a few months ago the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, which I co-chair, held a hearing on the repression of religious freedom in Tibet.

Tibetan Buddhists face extensive controls on their religious life—an intrusive official presence in monasteries, pervasive surveillance, limits on travel and communications, and ideological re-education campaigns. Religious expression and activism have been met with violent repression, imprisonment and torture.

As of last August, 69 monks, nuns or Tibetan reincarnate teachers were known to be

serving sentences in Chinese prisons—although the real number is likely much higher.

And the Chinese government continues to claim the prerogative to decide who will succeed His Holiness the Dalai Lama, the highest figure in Tibetan Buddhism, who is now 82 years old.

This extreme Chinese interference in the physical and spiritual lives of Tibetans occurs even though the Tibetans seek only to fully exercise the autonomy guaranteed them by the Chinese constitution and China's ''Law on Regional Ethnic Autonomy.'' In the late 1980s the Dalai Lama proposed the Middle Way Approach as a path toward Tibetan autonomy within China, and he has pursued that path through non-violence ever since.

Then there are the Uyghurs. Like the Tibetans, the Uyghurs are the victims of restrictions imposed by the Chinese authorities on their religious, cultural and linguistic practices.

The repression of Uyghurs has increased since July 2009, when a police attack on Uyghur demonstrators led to rioting and nearly 200 deaths. Between 2013 and 2015, clashes involving Uyghurs and Xinjiang public security personnel led to hundreds more deaths.

In the aftermath of these kinds of fatal encounters, the Chinese authorities have claimed the Uyghurs were carrying out or preparing to launch attacks against government property or civilians. But credible human rights groups argue that many violent incidents began as peaceful protests—again, a form of loyal opposition.

Meanwhile, Human Rights Watch has reported that Chinese authorities in Xinjiang are collecting DNA samples, fingerprints, iris scans, and blood types of all residents in the region between the age of 12 and 65.

For what purpose? Are we witnessing steps toward some kind of ethnicity-based attack on the whole of the Uyghur people?

And there have been alarming reports regarding the detention and possible mistreatment of some family members of U.S.-based Uyghur rights activist Rebiya Kadeer, feared to be in retribution for her human rights advocacy efforts. This could be another instance of China's efforts to silence criticism through intimidation, detention, and threats to the families of activists living abroad.

Unfortunately, I could go on and on.

But I want to close with recommendations.

I am guided by two principles. We as Americans must defend human rights and democracy, values that have made us a great nation. And there must be consequences for bad behaviour.

But as Chinese authorities consistently work to undermine democratic participation within its borders and violate the human rights of their peoples, I do not see any consequences. It is time to impose some.

I urge us to start by passing two pieces of legislation on Tibet that have been introduced in the House: H.R. 1872, the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act, and H. Con. Res. 89, expressing the sense of Congress that the treatment of the Tibetan people should be an important factor in the conduct of United States relations with the People's Republic of China.

I urge the full and robust implementation of the Tibet Policy Act of 2002—including the designation of the Special Coordinator for Tibetan Policy, a statutory position that the Administration has yet to fill.

I urge the robust use of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to sanction Chinese officials responsible for grave violations of the human rights of Tibetans, Uyghurs, and the many other loyal opposition activists who have been targeted in recent years—human rights lawyers, religious practitioners, writers, artists.

I urge a united expression of support from this House for the release of Liu Xia. She should be allowed to leave China.

I urge this House to support the right of His Holiness the Dalai Lama to return to his homeland.

I urge the U.S. Consul General in Hong Kong to speak out loudly and forcefully on behalf of Joshua Wong, Nathan Law and other pro-democracy advocates in Hong Kong. We must hold China strictly accountable for the terms of the 1997 transfer of sovereignty.

These steps may not be enough to turn back China's increasing authoritarianism. But they would be a start.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NORTH STATE ICON MORISS TAYLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) is recognized for 5 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me some of his time. I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, tonight it is with great sadness that I rise to pay tribute to a man who passed recently in the north State, an icon. Moriss Taylor passed last week at the age of 93. He was a cowboy singer and a local legend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know House rules require that you wear a jacket and wear a tie and it is not allowed to wear hats on the floor, so I respect that, but I will do what I can, in the spirit of Moriss Taylor, to wear the type of clothing typically you would see on his show with this Western shirt. Of course, his were much fancier than this one I am wearing here tonight in what I think is known in Nashville as the nudie jacket style, where it is very, very well decorated with rhinestones and shiny objects like that.

And so you see the gentleman right here. I mean, how can you not like that and feel at home with someone like that?

Moriss was born in Miami, Oklahoma in 1925, and at age 14 he settled in southern Butte County, in Palermo, California.

Of course, his ''Moriss Taylor Show,'' he was the beloved host of that from 1956 to 1995 on KHSL-TV, Channel 12, from Chico, California.

□ 2100

He had an incredible 39-year run of entertaining folks each weekend. His show was a soothing blend of relaxing country western music and original music performed by himself and his many talented guests.

Many of the members of his band were people you would see just right around Butte County in northern California that worked during the week in places that anybody would likely patronize. I have seen his band members at auto parts stores where I shop, or at the feed store where I shop over time, and many others like that. They were just regular folks in the community who were blending their talents with Moriss Taylor on the weekend and other venues around northern California.

As kids, we used to watch the show on the weekends and we grew up listening to the country music staples on his show as well as the jokes. Some might say they were corny jokes, but they were also clean jokes and something you can just have a little chuckle over and enjoy.

But they indeed were a staple, along with the country music in their own right. So, for example, I have got to share a couple of them.

One of his jokes would be: ''They say dogs make great chiropractors because they know where all the bones are.''

Or, ''Did you hear the one about the dentist who married the manicurist? They have been fighting tooth and nail ever since.''

See what I mean?

They might make you groan a little bit, but they do make you smile, and they sure make you think of a different time when things were just a little simpler, a little more respectful, and innocent.

Moriss also hosted a weekly radio show from the 1940s until his retirement. Indeed, the show brought tremendous happiness to many people in northern California. What is not maybe as well known about Moriss is that he was also a decorated veteran of World War II, where he flew in a cargo plane between India and China. He went on to receive the Distinguished Flying Cross, which is second only in prestige to the Medal of Honor.

Again, being an Oklahoman, he moved to northern California, where he quickly became a local icon in our community. He was well loved and a great patriot.

One time, in a personal experience, I was out campaigning, going door to door, this time in Chico, California, and I happened upon his door. He opened it up, and I hadn't really looked at the walk sheet too closely at that point. It was night, so there he was, Moriss Taylor at the door. So I was kind of taken aback because here is the local legend.

He invited me right in and we sat down for a little bit, and he told me a little bit about his politics there and that he was a participant as well. It didn't come out in the show, and probably good and respectfully so. But he said: ''You know, Doug, you are all right and I support you. You are doing a good job,'' which means a lot from a guy like that, that somehow maybe I am on the right track here.

So each week on his show they played a lot of songs and made a lot of

jokes, and he would end the show with his original song called ''High Sierra.'' So maybe I will share just a few of those lyrics right now:

High Sierra, skies are blue,
Whispering pines remind me of you.
Walking together, over meadows green,
We pledged our love, by a rippling stream.
I can see the sunlight shining on her golden hair
And hear the words she told me as we were standing there.
High Sierra, calling me home.

It is at this point in the show where the credits would fade out. The lyrics would come to an end, and people were already waiting again for next Sunday to come around.

As the song says, High Sierra is once again calling him home. After 93 years of enriching the lives of northern Californians, many of us were fortunate enough to sing along with him during those 93 years. Those memories won't fade. There will never be another like Moriss Taylor. He will be greatly missed, indeed.

High Sierra, calling him home.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) is recognized for 57 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ESPAILLAT. 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 the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I stand on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives as the clock keeps ticking for us to act on behalf of DREAMers and DACA recipients.

Tonight, this House approved a continuing resolution funding government to continue to stay open for another 4 weeks that did not include a resolution to the dire conditions faced by DREAMers and DACA recipients. It did not include funding for community based health clinics, and it certainly did not adequately support the men and women in our Armed Forces.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, as we continue to move forward, many Members of this House have worked diligently throughout the months to address the issues faced by DREAMers and DACA recipients. In fact, they have engaged in bipartisan legislative solutions. And we currently have three bipartisan bills that could have been voted on today on this very same floor of the House of Representatives. I guarantee you that if they would have been brought here to this floor and they would have given us the opportunity to vote on them, they would have passed.

Because DREAMers are very popular in America. All polls show that over 80 percent of Americans across the Nation in different States, in different cities, want these young people to stay. Once you meet them, once you see their young faces, their energy, their desire to work and move forward, their patriotism for America, they win you over.

No other immigration-related issue, I believe, has polled as high as the support that DREAMers are getting from across the country. Folks who live in red States and blue States, in districts represented by Democrats, districts represented by Republicans, feel overwhelmingly that these young people should stay here; that they should not be punished and sent back to a country that many of them don't really know, where they have no connection with family members.

Some may not even speak the language spoken in those countries or be familiar with the customs in those nations. They feel they are Americans, and they have contributed tremendously to our Nation. So these bipartisan efforts and solutions that my colleagues have engaged in are very important.

Let's begin by talking about the Dream Act, a clean Dream Act, which is a bipartisan bill led by Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, a Democrat from California; and Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, a Republican from Florida.

This particular bill, the Dream Act, a clean Dream Act, has 200 bipartisan cosponsors, including myself. This is not amnesty. Many have tried to portray the DREAMers' quest and fight as a fight for amnesty. This is not amnesty. This particular bill, which has over 200 cosponsors, asks of the DREAMers that in order for them to be eligible for the Dream Act, that a person needed to have been 18 years of age on the date of entry, that they must have been physically present in the U.S. 4 years prior to the enactment of the legislation.

Any applicant could not be convicted of any offense punishable for more than 1 year, or three or more offenses resulting in 90 days or more of imprisonment. In other words, they had to have a clean record.

This was just to be considered. Once they were accepted into the program, they will get a conditional permanent residency status, a temporary green card. Then to transition to lawful permanent residence under the Dream Act, a DREAMer needed to do certain things. In other words, for them to transition from a conditional green card to a permanent green card, they needed to maintain a clean record for 8 years. They needed to have completed a college degree or 2 years for a bachelor's degree or higher, or they must have served in the military for 2 years.

It further asks that they would have to have been employed for at least 3 years for 75 percent of the time under the conditional permanent residency status.

In addition to that, only after meeting all of the above, could they then transition to legal permanent status. So after that, they would have to wait an additional 5 years for them to be able to apply for naturalization, citizenship. So they would have to wait in total, from the time they got their temporary green card to the time they actually will be eligible to apply for citizenship, a total of 13 years. More than a decade.

So the campaign to portray the Dream Act or a solution to the DREAMers and the DACA situation as amnesty is totally false. So 13 years—13 long years—they would have to wait from the minute they got a temporary green card to the time they will be eligible to apply for naturalization, citizenship.

So 80 percent of America supports these DREAMers. And this is the Dream Act, a bipartisan bill that has been around for some time, led by Republicans and Democrats that did not have a border security provision to it.

But we heard how the other side of the aisle wanted to address some of the concerns at the border. A group of bipartisan Members of this House led by Representative WILL HURD from Texas and PETE AGUILAR began to put together a second proposal, USA Act. And this proposal currently has 49 bipartisan cosponsors. It came out of efforts put together by a group called the Problem Solvers.

In this particular proposal, in order for you to be eligible for the USA Act, a person needed to be at least 18 years of age on the date of entry and not have been convicted, again, of an offense punishable for more than 1 year, or any combination of offenses resulting in imprisonment for more than 1 year. Then the person could transition to lawful permanent residency.

Again, they had to maintain a clean record for 8 years, and had to complete a college degree or complete 2 years in a bachelor's degree or higher postsecondary vocational programs. They must have served in the military for the entire length of their enlistment contract or been employed for at least 3 years 80 percent of the time they were under conditional permanent residency status. Only after meeting all of the above, could they then transition to legal permanent residency.

□ 2115

Then after 5 additional years, they will have been able to apply for naturalization.

The USA Act has a border security component unlike the clean Dream Act.

These bipartisan Members of this House tried to address some of the concerns of Members from across the aisle who continue to complain and be seriously concerned about border security. They included directing Homeland Security to deploy more technology along

the border and to submit a plan to Congress regarding expansion of vehicle, cargo, and pedestrian inspection lanes on the top 10 high-volume ports of entry.

This last clause in this bill is very important because our ports of entry are very antiquated and dilapidated. This is precisely where most of the illegal drugs, illegal guns, and human trafficking enters our Nation. This particular bill calls for revamping and modernizing these ports of entry. The USA Act also would add an additional 55 immigration judges per year over the next 3 fiscal years.

Finally, this bipartisan bill develops a strategy to address the factors driving migration from Northern Triangle countries in Central America.

So you have the Dream Act, the clean Dream Act, which many of us fought for. You have the USA Act, another bipartisan bill that many in this House fought to put together. But it does not end there.

In addition to these two avenues that could have been taken tonight here in this House to address the plight of 800,000 DREAMers, the Senate acted and sent us over an immigration framework of ideas led by Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN, in addition to Senators MICHAEL BENNET, JEFF FLAKE, and CORY GARDNER, and Senator BOB MENENDEZ from New Jersey.

Under this framework, the eligibility criteria bars DREAMers who have been convicted of crimes, and they must satisfy any Federal tax liability that they may have accrued while receiving work authorization under DACA.

A pathway to citizenship would be 12 years, unlike the other two proposals that call for 8 years, this is at 12 years, and 2 of which they could get credit for for their time under DACA.

This proposal, this framework, coming from the Senate also added additional border security elements which included $1.459 billion for wall planning, design, and construction, as well as an additional $1.1 billion for tactical infrastructure, software border surveillance technology, and other equipment.

All three of these bills were crafted under a bipartisan effort by Members from both sides of the aisle. I think that it is tragic that we lost another great opportunity tonight to bring any one of those three bills to this floor to be voted upon by the Members of this House, particularly since the public sentiment—over 80 percent of America feels that these young people should stay in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Texas, Congressman AL GREEN, who is my good friend and colleague.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I clearly, truly, and sincerely thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me. I would like to acknowledge that his message was most edifying. It was made perspicuously clear, and anyone having the opportunity to hear his message clearly understands that there is a pathway to success for the DREAMers. I am grateful that he has given his message, and I am honored that he has yielded to me.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. King—and I mention him tonight because we just celebrated his life and legacy, and I am still celebrating—but Dr. King reminded us that the time is always ripe—r-i-p-e—always ripe to do right. The time is always beneficial, the time is always right to do that which is right. There may appear to be circumstances before you that would cause you to conclude that there are great obstacles in your way, and because of these great obstacles, you probably should wait just a little bit longer. But there are some questions that cannot wait, and allowing time to pass will only allow greater harm to manifest itself. The time is always ripe, and the time is always right to do that which is right.

In the past, the not too distant past, I was accorded the preeminent privilege of bringing a privileged resolution before the Congress, and that resolution was one for impeachment. That resolution received 58 votes to further the opportunity for impeachment to be voted upon. There were a good many people who were of the opinion that this was 57 more votes than expected. I had no idea as to the number of votes that would be cast for moving the resolution forward such that there might be an up-or-down vote on impeachment. I had no idea. Fifty-eight votes was acceptable to me. But I also want the RECORD to show, Mr. Speaker, that if there had been but one vote, that would have been acceptable to me because the time is always ripe to do that which is right, and it was the right thing to do to bring the Articles of Impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to say that I believe the time is ripe for additional Articles of Impeachment, and, as a result thereof, tomorrow, additional Articles of Impeachment will be brought because the time is ripe and because allowing additional time to pass will only allow additional harm to manifest itself without a proper challenge having been made to things that are occurring from the Presidency that, Mr. Speaker, cannot be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to say that I have no idea as to what the vote will be when we vote tomorrow or within the next 2 legislative days, as required by the rules. My suspicion is that the vote will take place tomorrow. I don't set the time for the vote. I determine when the resolution will be presented, and the Speaker of the House determines when the actual vote will take place. That is his to decide. I respect any decision that he makes.

But as to my colleagues, I am not lobbying anyone to vote for this resolution. Each person must address what his or her conscience dictates. I have no idea as to what the vote will be, and I say this candidly because there are a good many people who will continually query: How will people vote? What will the outcome be? I have no idea, Mr. Speaker.

But I say this: whatever the outcome, I will know that I have done the right thing. I will know that I will be on the right side of history, and I will know that there are unborn generations who will look back through the vista of time, and they will make decisions about the actions we take at this time. I will let them judge.

It is unfortunate, but the people of the time that we live in can sometimes not be in the best position to judge the things that we do and the actions that we take. So I will know, Mr. Speaker, that we have done the right thing, and I will know that the judges who look through the vista of time will set the record straight for those who may have some confusion about what is happening at this time.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that whatever the vote is, it will be a vote that will be recorded on our RECORD. It will be the second vote, and I want the RECORD to show that I repeatedly stood on the right side of history. I will repeatedly do this. For those who may be concerned, this may not be the last vote. So there may be more than two votes that we will take that will show where we stand on this great question of our time.

What is the great question of our time? The great question of our time, as it relates to those of us in this country and around the world, is this: Are we going to allow the United States of America, the country that I love—no one sings ''The Star-Spangled Banner'' louder than I do, maybe not in a perfect key. No one recites the pledge with greater enthusiasm than I do. No one believes in the words told in the Pledge of Allegiance, liberty and justice, more than I do. No one believes in the words in the Declaration of Independence, ''All persons being created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights''—no one believes these things more than I. I love my country.

So the question is, this country, the leader of the free world—people around the world depend on us for leadership and guidance on the great issues impacting the world; whether they be political or moral, people in this world depend on the United States. People want to know: Where is the United States of America when it comes to a crisis? Regardless of the magnitude of the crisis, where are the Americans, the leaders of the free world?

So, Mr. Speaker, the question is: Will we allow our preeminence in the world to be diminished by a perception that we condone and accept, in fact, will tolerate, bigotry? Will we tolerate bigotry? Will we allow the bigotry emanating in this country from the highest office to become the image of the United States of America? Will we allow people around the world to think that we condone this? I think not,

which is why I will bring the Articles of Impeachment tomorrow.

It is my opinion that I—personal pronoun—will not and should not tolerate bigotry. I lived too long, Mr. Speaker, and I fought too hard. I have suffered too many indignations associated with segregation. I had the Klan burn a cross in my yard. I know what bigotry looks like, I know what it smells like, I know what it sounds like, and I know what it feels like.

So I have been involved and engaged in this struggle too long to tolerate it. I refuse to tolerate bigotry. The truth is, that which you will tolerate, you are not likely to change. If you will tolerate it, you are not likely to change it.

So my vote tomorrow will be one indicative of a person who will not tolerate bigotry. My vote tomorrow will be one that I trust young children in years to come will be proud to say: One American stood against bigotry.

We in this House have had years, in fact, centuries, to eradicate and eliminate the hatred associated with bigotry and invidious discrimination. We went through slavery.

□ 2130

We fought back. We went through segregation. We changed the laws. But we cannot allow ourselves to be put in a position such that it will be perceived that we are amenable to allowing the clock, the hands of time, to be rolled back to a time that none of us would like to return to. Surely, I would not, given what I know about how bigotry impacts the lives and the psyches of human beings.

We are confronting the great question of: What will the United States look like to the rest of the world? How will we be perceived?

But more important than this, Mr. Speaker, the question is really: Will we stand by silently when we can plainly and clearly see that wrong is being perpetrated and that people are being harmed?

Bigotry may not impact me the same way it impacts people who are working every day and who don't have the benefit of Congress to come to and to work in the facilities that I work in.

There are people who are hardworking Americans who are impacted by bigotry in ways that are harmful and that I and many others will not experience. There are people of color who will go in to apply for a loan and have their loans denied because of how they look. We have empirical evidence to support it. It happens. It still happens to people of color.

There are people who will be impacted by bigotry simply because of who they happen to associate with in their intimate personal lives. There is still bigotry associated with the LGBTQ community. You can be fired because of who they happen to be, the person that God created. They can be fired for being that person.

There are people who suffer from bigotry because of their religious beliefs. If you are Jewish, you may find yourself at some point suffering from bigotry perpetrated because of your belief in your God.

If you are Muslim, you may find yourself suffering from the horrors associated with bigotry and being banned from a country because of your religious beliefs and because you are of the Islamic faith.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on. These are everyday, hardworking people who suffer. Those of us who are here in Congress may not suffer all of these indignations, but there are times when some of us, too, will befall to the ugliness of bigotry.

Mr. Speaker, the question is: Will we allow people who we know we can help be assisted by virtue of the position that we take?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, sometime after we start our legislative day, I will come to the well and I will present Articles of Impeachment that will differ from the prior Articles of Impeachment. These articles will associate commentary made in the highest office in the land with policies that are produced.

When you are in the White House and you say ugly comments about a continent, the countries within that continent, about other countries, and you are talking about immigration policy, surely it is reasonable to conclude that your commentary can be converted into your policy, that it can become part of your policy, and that if you conclude and if you, by your commentary, would have us know that you may have concluded that people from a predominantly White country are more welcome than people from countries of color, it is not unreasonable for one to conclude that your immigration policy may be one that is race-based masquerading as one that is merit-based. It is not unreasonable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, I want to apologize to people who I may have offended with my message, because the intent is not to offend. The intent is to speak the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I take no great solace in having to bring this truth before the Congress of the United States of America. This is not something that I came to Congress to do. It is not something that I take great pleasure in doing. People say ugly things about me and to me. Just today, we had a call to our office, a threat that involved the taking of life.

So this is nothing that I do with any degree of pleasure. I do it because it is right. And to all of the people who I may have offended, to colleagues that may somehow think ill of what I do, you have my apologies. It is really not about you. It is about democracy. It is about government of the people, by the people, and whether we will maintain government of the people, by the people. It is about the Republic and whether we will do as Franklin indicated, keep the Republic that we have.

It really is not about any individual. It is not about any political party. It is about the greatest country in the world and whether we, who have the ability, the responsibility, if you will, to take on these challenges, will do so in such a way as to protect the institutions that we love.

I am giving you my position. I give no one else's position. I am a caucus of one. It is called the liberated democratic caucus. That is who I am, a liberated Democrat. That means that I cannot only speak truth to power, I can speak truth about power.

Tonight, the truth is that we have a country in crisis. The stock market is up, yes. Jobs, yes, people are employed. There is something to be said about the types of jobs at minimum wage, but for this soliloquy, let's just say people are employed.

But these things are not what make a country great. The greatness of a country is not measured by how we treat people who live in the sweets of life. The greatness of a country is measured by how you treat people who live in the streets of life. Those who live in the streets of life are the ones who have to cope with bigotry that many of us never see and many don't understand.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to have had this moment to talk about the time that we will share tomorrow. It will take place. I do look forward to having the opportunity to stand in the well again of the Congress of America. It is a preeminent privilege, a superlative pleasure, and a splendiferous honor.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Congressional Progressive Caucus for allowing and facilitating this Special Order hour on DREAMers and DACA.

On my previous intervention, I highlighted how we contemplated tonight, as this House passed a continuing resolution to fund government, and how for many months we contemplated three pieces of legislation to address the issues of DACA recipients and DREAMers that were drafted in a bipartisan way.

As I mentioned earlier, the first one is the clean Dream Act. The second one, put together by the Problem Solvers Caucus, is the USA Act.

The other Chamber, which is convening right now as I speak to debate whether or not the government should continue to be funded and to take up the continuing resolution that we sent over to the other House, as they debate that, they will realize that none of the three proposals that I highlighted earlier—the Dream Act, the USA Act, and also the immigration framework that came over from bipartisan Senators—is included in that continuing resolution, leaving the DREAMers and DACA recipients out in the cold, propelling me to once again vote against the continuing resolution, as I did over 3 weeks ago.

This particular issue impacts 800,000 DREAMers across the Nation, a population bigger than any one of our congressional districts.

Mr. Speaker, they will have a profound impact on the economy if they are left out in the cold. According to the Center for American Progress, my district, the 13th Congressional District in New York which I represent, will lose more than $155 million in their own local GDP. My home State, New York, will lose $2.6 billion. This is not chump change. This is what the numbers show that we will lose.

So this is not a matter to be taken lightly. These young people are not just a group of folks who will have an important impact on our economy. They are also having an impact on healthcare. Many of them are working to serve our senior population. Many of them continue to be providing services impacting patients across our Nation's healthcare system.

According to a 2016 survey by groups, including the National Immigration Law Center and the Center for American Progress, more than one in five DREAMers also works in the healthcare and educational industries.

So these young people who are being left out in the cold by this continuing resolution that is being debated in the Senate right now work in our hospitals, in our clinics, in our community-based clinics. They take care of our seniors, our children, those who are perhaps ill with a catastrophic disease. They also work in our educational system. So they are productive members of our society.

Let me just say that they are also working very hard to distinguish themselves in higher education. Every year, an estimated 65,000 undocumented students graduate from high school. About 10,000 undocumented students graduate from college every single year.

Before President Obama announced DACA, these young people faced great barriers when it came to higher education. We are nowhere close to where we need to be if 55,000 high school graduates are not pursuing a higher education.

Let's not forget these students. Let's not forget these DREAMers. Let's not forget these DACA recipients. We have made a full effort in the House and in the Senate to have a bipartisan approach to solving this issue, but yet, once again, the continuing resolution which is currently, right now, being debated in the Senate chose to leave the DREAMers out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue this fight. I ask the DREAMers not to be afraid. I ask them not to be deterred, not to be discouraged, not to dismay. We will continue this fight until they are allowed to stay here with their families and they can continue to make America a stronger nation.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 117. An act to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as ''Alex Diekmann Peak''.

S. 139. An act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to improve foreign intelligence collection and the safeguards, accountability, and oversight of acquisitions of foreign intelligence, to extend title VII of such Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 19, 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:

3788. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Alan R. Lynn, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3789. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Priorities List [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2017-0073, 0074, 0075 and 0076; FRL-9973-00-OLEM] received January 12, 2018, 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.

3790. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Texas [EPA-R06-OAR-2017-0061; FRL-9972-28-Region 6] received January 12, 2018, 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.

3791. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls [CG Docket No.: 17-59] received January 12, 2018, 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.

3792. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Modification of Subpart G, Section 0.701 of the Commission's Rules received January 12, 2018, 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.

3793. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 11 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Emergency Alert System [PS Docket No.: 15-94] received January 12, 2018, 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.

3794. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions, Clarifications, and Technical Corrections to the Export Administration Regulations [170207157-7157-01] (RIN: 0694-AH31) received January 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3795. 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.

3796. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments received January 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3797. A letter from the Acting Director and General Counsel, General Counsel and Legal Policy Division, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustments for Ethics in Government Act Violations (RIN: 3209-AA38) received January 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 4819. A bill to promote inclusive economic growth through conservation and biodiversity programs that facilitate transboundary cooperation, improve natural resource management, and build local capacity to protect and preserve threatened wildlife species in the greater Okavango River Basin of southern Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SOTO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms.

WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. KIHUEN):

H.R. 4820. A bill to extend funding for certain public health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Ms. CHENEY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 4821. A bill to impose sanctions against entities owned or controlled by the Armed Forces of Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, 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 Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 4822. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to reform the procedures provided under such Act for the initiation, investigation, and resolution of claims alleging that employing offices of the legislative branch have violated the rights and protections provided to their employees under such Act, including protections against sexual harassment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Ethics, Oversight and Government Reform, 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 Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 4823. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to include certain areas in the Central Texas Corridor; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 4824. A bill to allow certain State permitting authority to encourage expansion of broadband service to rural communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4825. A bill to improve medical research on marijuana; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H.R. 4826. A bill to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to require the development of ethics plans for certain transition teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MENG, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. COLE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 4827. A bill to provide for the compensation of Federal employees furloughed during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 4828. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to define the term natural cheese; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 4829. A bill to promote a 21st Century artificial intelligence workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MAST, Mr. JONES, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 4830. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the disapproval of any course of education for purposes of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs unless the educational institution providing the course permits individuals to attend or participate in courses pending payment by Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 4831. A bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that an eligible telecommunications carrier may use high cost universal service support to aid in the restoration of telecommunications capabilities in an area in which the President has declared a major disaster or emergency and may elect to receive an advance payment of such support; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MOORE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 4833. A bill to require that States release persons charged with a misdemeanor on non-monetary conditions only prior to court adjudication; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4834. A bill to enable State and local promotion of alternative fuel and high-efficiency motor vehicle fleets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 4835. A bill to extend the pilot program on off-base transition training for veterans and spouses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 4836. A bill to provide an exemption to noncontiguous States for certain essential air service requirements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 4837. A bill to prohibit the introduction of the Armed Forces into hostilities in North Korea without a declaration of war or explicit statutory authorization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4838. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award institutions of higher education grants for teaching English learners; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 4839. A bill to provide for the establishment of an inventory of Federal assets to provide information to entities that construct or operate communications facilities or provide communications service; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4840. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 East Franklin Street in Oviedo, Florida, as the ''Sergeant First Class Alwyn Crendall Cashe Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 4841. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for electronic prior authorization under Medicare part D for covered part D drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 4842. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that the Federal Communications Commission is not required to perform any review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 or division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, as a condition of permitting the placement and installation of a communications facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 4843. A bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans who were exposed to herbicide agents while serving in the Armed Forces in Thailand during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KILMER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 699. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 12, 2018, as ''Darwin Day'' and recognizing the importance of science in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BASS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SIRES, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. TITUS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BERA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HECK, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. KILMER):

H. Res. 700. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding President Donald J. Trump's remarks about Haiti, El Salvador, and African Nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLORES:

H. Res. 701. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that with respect to any study required to be conducted by the Federal Communications Commission, or any entity regulated by the Commission under the Federal Communications Act of 1934, under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 or division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (formerly known as the National Historic Preservation Act), for the provision of broadband infrastructure, the area to be studied should be limited to the area of impact; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Res. 702. A resolution recognizing the roles and the contributions of America's Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists (CRNAs) and their role in providing quality healthcare for the public; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H. Res. 703. A resolution designating the week of January 21 through January 27, 2018, as ''National School Choice Week''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 704. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the courageous work and life of Argentine prosecutor Alberto Nisman, and calling for a swift and transparent investigation into his tragic death in Buenos Aires on January 18, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 4819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 4820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 4821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One Section Eight of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 4822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 5 of the United States Constitution

''Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to

day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide.

Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Each House shall keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such Parts as may in their Judgment require Secrecy; and the Yeas and Nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the Desire of one fifth of those Present, be entered on the Journal.''

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 4823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 4825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which grants Congress the power to, among other things, regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 4826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 4827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 4828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 the Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 4829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 4830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the United State Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 4831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 4835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 4836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 4837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 11

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 4839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: ''To establish Post offices and postal roads.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Necessary and Proper Clause

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 4841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 4842.

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. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 4843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

A bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans exposed to herbicides while serving in Thailand

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 113: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 350: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 389: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 466: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 483: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 547: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 681: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 719: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 771: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 850: Mr. COLE, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 858: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 959: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1173: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1192: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1212: Mr. COOK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COLE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1227: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1298: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1322: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1339: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1426: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1456: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1494: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1536: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1554: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1661: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1675: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 1683: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1810: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1861: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1928: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1953: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 2004: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2092: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 2147: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2166: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 2220: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 2401: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 2528: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 2688: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2740: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2856: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 2871: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 2890: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2899: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2996: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 3528: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 3635: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 3654: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3664: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 3692: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 3711: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 3730: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 3738: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. POLIS, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3755: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3780: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 3842: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3976: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 4058: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 4062: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4099: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 4116: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4117: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4122: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4143: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 4152: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 4159: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4160: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4198: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 4203: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 4221: Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4229: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 4253: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 4256: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 4274: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 4312: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4392: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 4396: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 4413: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4451: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4453: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 4476: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 4494: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4505: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4547: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 4575: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 4582: Mr. RUSH and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4607: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4635: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4647: Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 4666: Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 4684: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4691: Mr. QUIGLEY, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4693: Mr. QUIGLEY, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4704: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 4706: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 4712: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4725: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 4732: Mr. KILMER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 4736: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4747: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4760: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 4768: Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 4784: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 4794: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. COLE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 4796: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 4815: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mrs. DINGELL.
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GALLEGO, and Ms. FUDGE.
H. Res. 220: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H. Res. 244: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 257: Mr. CULBERSON.
H. Res. 401: Mr. NOLAN.
H. Res. 570: Mr. GOHMERT.
H. Res. 684: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. MAST.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

76. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Pascagoula, Mississippi, relative to a resolution supporting continued and increased exploration and production of Gulf of Mexico energy resources; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 2018 No. 11

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Creator and Redeemer, cleanse us from anything that hinders the knowing and doing of Your will. Give our lawmakers clean hands and pure hearts which will fit them to serve You and all people. Liberate them from forces that keep them from moving toward consensus. As they seek to bring unity to our Nation and world, teach them how to best serve the common welfare, to assure personal freedoms, and to fulfill the purposes of Your Kingdom. Lord, bless them beyond their expectations.

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 18, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BOOZMAN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

FISA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in just a short while, the Senate will vote to reauthorize important provisions of the FISA Amendments Act. As we all know, section 702 remains one of the most important tools that our national security professionals use to combat terrorism and to keep Americans safe.

Let's be very clear about what section 702 does. It enables our intelligence community to collect communications from foreign terrorists on foreign soil who threaten America and our allies. That is what it does. Make no mistake—section 702 does not allow the targeting of American citizens, nor does it permit the targeting of anyone, no matter their nationality, who is known to be located here in the United States.

The men and women we trust to protect this country say that this capability is essential to their missions. They tell us that it has saved American lives. That is why we cannot let this capability lapse. The world remains dangerous. We need our Armed Forces and intelligence community to protect us, and they need us to give them the tools to do it.

I look forward to renewing this important provision on a bipartisan basis in a short while.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, Saturday will mark 1 year since President Trump's inauguration—a year spent working with Republicans to roll back runaway regulations, stand up for veterans, fund our troops, strengthen national security, and pass once-in-a-generation tax reform.

Today, unemployment is at its lowest level in over a decade. According to Gallup, the American people are more optimistic about their job prospects than they have been in 17 years. And just yesterday, the Dow Jones closed above 26,000 for the first time in history.

The engine of American free enterprise is the American people, and when government gets out of the way and helps provide the conditions for growth, good things happen.

Just yesterday, Apple—the highest valued public company in the world—announced a plan to create more than 20,000 new jobs and invest $30 billion in new capital right here in our country. As a direct result of tax reform, Apple will pay special bonuses worth $2,500 to employees and begin to repatriate the $250 billion in cash it has been holding overseas. Let me repeat that. Billions and billions of dollars are coming back to America because Republicans passed historic tax reform and gave us a 21st-century tax code. This will have an impact not just in Silicon Valley but all across the country. In Harrodsburg, KY, Corning employs hundreds of people in a high-tech facility. It partners with Apple to manufacture the special glass used in iPhones and iPads. This glass is made in Kentucky.

Republicans in the House and Senate passed tax reform without a single Democratic vote, although I certainly hope our folks across the aisle will celebrate the new jobs in their States and the new opportunities that are already being created for their constituents. We know that when Washington gets

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

out of the way, American workers and job creators can do what they do best. The results are speaking for themselves.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, on an urgent matter, Congress is fast approaching our Friday deadline to fund the government. The choice before us is quite simple: We can pass a noncontroversial, bipartisan bill to keep the government open, or Democrats in Congress can manufacture a crisis and force a government shutdown over the entirely unrelated issue of illegal immigration, which we have until March, at the very least, to resolve.

Leaders in both parties have engaged in constructive talks on the best solution for those who fall under the Obama administration's illegally established DACA Program, along with other important immigration issues. The President has made it clear that any immigration bill must not only treat the symptoms of illegal immigration but also address the conditions that cause it. His four pillars for reform are increasing border security, reforming chain migration, resolving the DACA issue, and addressing the visa lottery. Those are the four pillars.

My position is straightforward. When negotiators produce a compromise that the President supports, it will receive a vote here in the Senate. No such solution yet exists, so the negotiations continue. The DACA issue does not face urgent deadlines until March at the very earliest. Our deadline to fund the government is tomorrow. One is an emergency, and one is not.

Later today, we anticipate the House will pass a bill that continues government funding and also attends to another urgent bipartisan concern. It will reauthorize the State Children's Health Insurance Program for a full 6 years, giving needed security to the families of the 9 million American children who depend on the program for coverage.

A continuing resolution plus a 6-year SCHIP extension is a commonsense package that every Member of this body should support.

Just consider my Democratic colleagues' own words on this very subject of the Children's Health Insurance Program. Just last month, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania said: ''Any uncertainty about the Children's Health Insurance Program is . . . an insult to the country.'' That is the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. He represents 342,000 children enrolled in SCHIP. Now he will have a chance to end that uncertainty.

Our newest colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama, made SCHIP a central issue in his campaign. He presented himself as a champion of vulnerable kids. He said the Senate had to ''stop playing political football with the health care of our children.'' Now he represents 150,000 of those children. Will he help us put a stop to the political games?

The senior Senator from Ohio said: ''Healthcare for our kids shouldn't be controversial . . . it shouldn't be partisan. It should be easy.''

The junior Senator from Maine called a potential lapse in SCHIP ''an abdication of our responsibility.''

The junior Senator from Oregon said: ''Struggling families would like to have some stability, not have their children be a bargaining chip in some broader vision.''

All of these Democratic Senators represent tens of thousands of children who depend on SCHIP. I am more than puzzled why they would threaten to turn their backs on those children—and shut down the government while they are at it—over the entirely unrelated issue of illegal immigration. Why would anyone suggest it is a good idea to not fund SCHIP for 6 years and to not fund the government because they are upset over illegal immigration, which is an issue we have until March to address?

Last year, the Senate Finance Committee unanimously agreed on a proposal to extend SCHIP by 5 years. The continuing resolution we expect to take up will extend it for 6, with no partisan attachments. It shouldn't be a difficult vote.

There is nothing—nothing—in such a continuing resolution that my Democratic friends actually oppose. Surely they do not oppose continuing to fund programs for opioid treatment and prevention, even as negotiations continue on additional funding. Surely they do not oppose continuing to fund our military and our national security, even as negotiations continue on additional funding. They couldn't possibly want to cut off existing funding for veterans, the VA system, and America's seniors simply because we are still negotiating additional funding.

My friends on the other side of the aisle do not oppose a single thing in this bill—nothing. They know they can't possibly explain to our warfighters and veterans, to our seniors, to our opioid treatment centers, to the millions of vulnerable children and their families who depend on SCHIP for coverage—how do you explain this?—or to all Americans who rely on the Federal Government for critical services like food inspections and Social Security checks. Why would they filibuster government funding and shut down vital programs for Americans because we have not yet agreed on the best way to settle an unrelated issue that we have at least until March to resolve?

So let's fund the government, extend SCHIP, and do right by the millions of Americans who elected us to serve them. That is how we can continue serious discussions on issues facing our Nation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CHIP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before I move to the bulk of my remarks, let me respond to the majority leader's comments on CHIP.

First, let me say I am a good friend of Leader MCCONNELL. We are getting along quite nicely. I know what a difficult job he has, but sometimes he says things that are just way over the top, and I have to respond, as this morning, to his remarks on CHIP.

Of course, Democrats support CHIP, Leader MCCONNELL. You know that darn well. If we were in charge of this Chamber, we would have never let it expire, but your majority did, Leader MCCONNELL. Your majority let health insurance for 9 million children expire, even though there were bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress that would have extended it.

Now it is placed on the CR. That is a bad idea for so many reasons that I will get to shortly, and Republicans pretend Democrats are against CHIP. It is outrageous.

We are leaders of our parties, and we say certain things, but it seems the lack of straightforwardness, the lack of relying on any facts that is endemic at that end of Pennsylvania Avenue is seeping over to the majority leader's desk, and I regret that because what he said this morning about CHIP was outrageous. To suggest that Democrats are standing in the way of CHIP is drawing, Leader MCCONNELL, on a deep well of bad faith.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let's get to the issue at hand. Government funding expires at midnight tomorrow and still the House Republican majority is moving forward with a continuing resolution that is very likely to be unacceptable to the Senate and may well be unacceptable to House Republicans. The CR prepared by the Speaker is not an honest attempt to govern. As typical of this Republican majority, it was done with zero negotiations with Democrats. They could get away with that strategy on the tax bill when they forced it through reconciliation; they can't here.

When are our Republican leaders going to learn that the best way to

govern—the best way to accomplish things—is by talking to us, not dropping ultimatums on us that bear none of our input? That is what happened with the FISA bill. It nearly went down. That had divisions on both sides of the aisle. That is what is happening here, and it doesn't look good for the CR coming over from the House for that very reason.

Furthermore, the CR leaves out so many priorities that the American people want and demand—opioids, veterans, pensions. It doesn't resolve the fate of the Dreamers. It doesn't include an increase in military funding that Members from both sides of the aisle would support. It is just another kick of the can down the road because the Republicans—both in the Senate and the House and the White House—can't get their act together.

Even President Trump tweeted this morning that he opposed including CHIP on this bill. Does that mean he is against the CR? Who knows? It is a mess. We can't keep careening from short-term CR to short-term CR. If this bill passes, there will be no incentive to negotiate, and we will be right back here in a month with the same problems at our feet. Eventually, we need to make progress on the biggest of issues before us.

Don't ask me; ask Secretary Mattis. When you talk to him, he knows how bad it is to continue CRs on the defense side. Why would our Republican colleagues go along with that?

So this CR can't get the job done. House Republicans don't even know if they can pass it. Some Senate Republicans, like my friends from South Carolina and South Dakota, have said they don't want to vote for it. We are going to have to go in a different direction.

Ideally, we would all roll up our sleeves and try to reach an agreement on all of the issues we need to resolve. We can resolve the issues of caps for defense and nondefense spending; we can resolve disaster relief; we can resolve the healthcare issues; we can resolve immigration issues; and we can do all of this in a rather short time because work has already been done on each of them for a while.

We could easily sit down and find a cosmic agreement that would get the support of the majority on both sides, in both Houses, and keep the government open. Despite all the rhetoric around here, I genuinely believe that.

The one thing standing in our way is the unrelenting flow of chaos from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. It has reduced the Republicans to shambles. We barely know whom to negotiate with. The President, on national television, tells Congress to bring him something, and he will sign it. The majority leader says he needs the President's imprimatur before we cut any deal. The President is like Abbott and Leader MCCONNELL is like Costello: You do it. They point at each other and nothing gets done.

Of course, the principal reason the Republicans are in such disarray is, the President and his team have been agents of chaos in these negotiations since day one. After all, President Trump was the one who said last year that we need ''a good 'shutdown' . . . to fix mess!'' The President said we need a government shutdown.

Mr. President, 95 percent of all Americans, I would guess, do not agree with you. I would guess in their hearts, 95 percent of all Senators and Congressmen—Democratic and Republican—don't agree with you, President Trump, when you say we need a good shutdown.

Don't just ask me. Here is POLITICO. They are a rather down-the-middle publication. No one thinks they are leftwing or rightwing. No one thinks they are FOX or MSNBC. Here is the headline: ''Negotiators on Hill find Trump an unreliable partner.'' Lawmakers find it difficult or impossible to negotiate when the President can't seem to stick to a position for more than a few hours. Let me read the first paragraph of this article:

> Donald Trump ran for President as a bipartisan deal-maker. But if there's one thing he's proved after a year in office, he's better at killing bipartisan deals than clinching them.

Again, that is the first paragraph in this paper. I am going to read it again so the American people hear it loud and clear—and I know some of the rivals of this publication don't like it too much, but c'est la vie. ''Negotiators on Hill find Trump an unreliable partner.'' The first paragraph:

> Donald Trump ran for President as a bipartisan deal-maker, but if there's one thing he's proved after a year in office, he's better at killing bipartisan deals than clinching them.

No truer words were ever written. That is not fake news, Mr. President. We all know it to be true.

Exhibit A, yesterday regarding the discussions on DACA, the majority leader said: ''I'm looking for something that President Trump is going to support. And he has not yet indicated what measure he is willing to sign.'' MITCH MCCONNELL said that. He said he still has to ''figure out what [the President] is for.''

How can you negotiate when the President—who has to sign legislation—is like a sphinx on this issue or at least says one thing one day and another the next?

The President rescinded DACA 4 or 5 months ago. Had he not rescinded DACA, we would not be here today. Remember, the vast majority of the American people—even a narrow majority of Trump supporters—support keeping the kids here, not sending them home. The President rescinded DACA 4 or 5 months ago and told Congress to fix it. Yet the majority leader of his party seems to have no firm idea what policy the President would support to get that done. At this late hour, that is astonishing.

Exhibit B, the President's Chief of Staff has insisted that Senator COTTON and Representative GOODLATTE be in the room for negotiations on DACA. I have great respect for each of them as individuals—or the respect every Senator gives to every other Senator and Member of Congress, although I so objected to what Senator COTTON did to Senator DURBIN the other day. But having said that, there is no deal that Senator COTTON or Representative GOODLATTE supports that would earn the support of the majority in either the House or the Senate.

If Senator COTTON and Representative GOODLATTE, who have opposed DACA all along and have basically been strongly anti-immigration, have veto power over an agreement, everyone knows there will not be an agreement. General Kelly must know that.

Then, just this morning—exhibit B prime—President Trump rebuked General Kelly, his own Chief of Staff, on Twitter for saying that he is fighting for a wall different from the one he campaigned on. So that is exhibit B on the incompetence of the Republicans on both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue—mixed messages, conflicting signals, chaos.

Exhibit C. Today, with the government shutdown one day away, President Trump is off campaigning in Pennsylvania instead of staying in Washington to help close a deal. We are 1 day away from a government shutdown, and there is no one home at the White House. The President should be here negotiating. There is no better evidence that the President doesn't give a hoot if the government shuts down than the fact that he is away campaigning today, 1 day before the shutdown looms.

We have spent the last few months negotiating in good faith with our Republican counterparts, trying desperately to find a deal we could all live with, but it has been nearly impossible to reach final agreement with this President. He has oscillated between completely opposing positions in a matter of days, sometimes hours. He has signaled an openness to a deal, only to have his staff pull him back. He has given only vague indications of what he wants, even at this late hour.

MITCH MCCONNELL was right; he doesn't know what the President stands for. Now MITCH MCCONNELL ought to have the strength and courage to start negotiating on his own for the good of the country, but that hasn't happened yet either.

The White House has done nothing but sow chaos, confusion, division, and disarray, and it may just lead to a government shutdown that no one wants and that all of us here have been striving to avoid.

The fact remains that there is a bipartisan deal on the table, led by Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN. Seven Democrats and seven Republicans are on the bill right now. I hope and suspect more will join. It includes significant concessions from Democrats on

almost every item the President requested, including his full budget request for border security, changes to family reunification—which he calls chain migration—and an end to the diversity lottery system.

There is no other alternative on the table. I repeat: There is no other alternative on the table. If my Republican friends want to protect the Dreamers, as over 70 percent of Americans say we should, this is the deal.

The White House is not going to help us; we know that. We have to do it ourselves. Once we do it, we can solve all of our other problems on defense and domestic spending, on healthcare, including CHIP, community health center extenders, disaster relief, and more.

Let's roll up our sleeves and get to work on both sides of the aisle, regardless of the dithering, the indecision, and the contradictory statements of the White House.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 139, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 139, a bill 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.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with McConnell amendment No. 1870 (to the House amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1871 (to amendment No. 1870), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:15 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, when we complete our work today on the FISA issue, we will be consumed by the issue of a continuing resolution and the need for continued appropriations to keep government functions available to the American people.

I come with a suggestion that I think is based not on politics but upon commonsense and perhaps just the good business aspect of getting our work done. My suggestion to our colleagues is that we do not shut down government. I think the outcome of that is not good, and I can list the reasons. I have had constituents from time to time tell me ''shut her down. It wouldn't matter to me,'' but I can list the circumstances in which it really does matter to everyday folks in Kansas and across the country. At the same time, we should force ourselves to do work that we seemingly are unwilling or unable to complete. There is a whole list of things that are pending, and they have been pending for a long time.

The Presiding Officer and I serve on the Appropriations Committee, and one of the positions that I think we share is the desire to see that the appropriations process works. That means that we would do a budget. The Budget Committee would do a budget, and the Senate and the House would approve the budget. We would do 12 appropriations bills that fill in the budget space. We would be able to prioritize spending. We could increase, reduce, or eliminate spending. Then, we could again send a message to agencies, departments, and cabinets that we have the ability to determine how much money they have to spend and, therefore, have the opportunity to influence decisions that are made that affect the American people through the bureaucracy and through the administration in such significant ways.

So the goal here is to keep government functioning—no shutdown—but also to have the discipline necessary to put an appropriations process in place to get us out of a CR.

Immigration, from DACA to border security, is certainly a topic of conversation in Congress, and negotiations are apparently ongoing and it is an issue that needs to be resolved. If we are going to make fixes to our immigration system, now is better than later. If border security is important, now is better than later to improve border security. If certainty in people's lives is important, now is better than later.

Many of us have a concern that we are not adequately funding the defense side. We face many threats, from China in the Pacific to Russia and its intrusion, from cyber issues that affect our national security to terrorism and the Middle East. If additional money is necessary for our intelligence capabilities and for our national defense, now is better than later.

What may happen here is that we will pass a continuing resolution that takes us weeks into the future and we will operate under a continuing resolution, or, if that is not possible, nothing may pass for several days and the so-called government shutdown would occur.

Here is what I would ask us to do. Let us do a continuing resolution for a day or so at a time, keeping government open, which puts the pressure on negotiations to occur to resolve the variety of issues that are out there today that, in all likelihood, will be attached to a final resolution. The question is, Do we do it now? Do we force those negotiations to occur and a resolution of those issues to happen? Do we force that today by being in a continuing resolution that is a very short period of time? Or do we give ourselves another month to allow the conversations to continue, and, in all likelihood, if history is any indication, a month from now we will be saying: Well, we need another CR while we continue.

The issues are important that are before us, and Congress has the habit of delaying resolutions of issues until the moment of crisis arrives. My point is this: Keep the pressure on us today. Do not let us walk away from here now without keeping government open, but do not let us leave the Senate and the Congress until we have resolved the issues in front of us. Those issues include healthcare, immigration, funding for national defense, domestic spending, and issues related to disaster—the Senator who presides today is from Florida—whether or not we do disaster assistance, which is a need as a result of the hurricanes that have caused tremendous damage in Texas and Florida and Puerto Rico. If we need that disaster relief—if it is needed—it is needed now, not later.

I have raised this topic. I have had this conversation with many of my colleagues.

I encourage us to continue to resolve our differences today—they will not be easier tomorrow—and make certain that we have an opportunity for us to then deal with the important issues that are still ahead of us. Outside of any agreement that might be reached in the next several days, we need to deal with issues that are important—what I would describe as issues that we will be dealing with that are normally important to us in May and June. But May and June will be occupied by the things we should have resolved now. So that in May and June, we will do the things we could have done today, and we will not be taking care of the July issues.

Common sense tells me that we can find a solution to the problems if we work at it, but if we allow ourselves to escape from the process today or tomorrow—if we return home—we will be

back in the same position next week and the week after that and the week after, which we are in today.

It is just a simple plea that the Senate exhibit some common sense, some good business practices. Let's resolve our differences now, and then let's take on the next issues that are so important to the country.

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

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

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, later this week, we are going to reach 1 year since President Trump was sworn into office as President of the United States. From what I have seen and from what I have heard, visiting with people at home, all around the State of Wyoming, his first year has been a huge success.

People are telling me, telling their friends, and telling their neighbors that America is finally headed in the right direction again. People tell me that they feel optimistic—optimistic because of the policies that Republicans have put in place over this past year.

The polling company Gallup says it is not just happening in Wyoming; it is happening all across the country. They had a report the other day that said Americans' confidence in our economy was positive in 2017, and they say that this was the first positive annual average since they started tracking these numbers back in 2008—the first time ever.

As soon as Donald Trump was elected President, economic confidence began to soar. It has stayed positive every single month since election day of 2016.

Gallup has said that this is the exact opposite of what they had seen for the previous 8 years.

In another poll last week, Gallup said that people are also more optimistic about the job market. They found that Americans' confidence about finding a job—a quality job—was the highest it has been in the 17 years since they have been asking that question as well.

They said that there was a ''sharp increase'' over the year before—in 2016, when President Obama was in charge—in people's feelings about being able to find a quality job. People are confident, and they are much more optimistic about the future. We see the signs of it everywhere we turn.

Stores had their biggest holiday sales since 2008. When people are feeling confident, they feel it is OK to go shopping. They feel there is going to be the income to cover the things they are interested in having for Christmas and the gifts they can give. They can relax. That is the kind of optimism we are seeing now.

It is because they see that President Trump and Republicans in Congress are serious about improving America's economy. They see that we are serious about giving relief to Americans who have been getting buried under an avalanche of redtape.

The President has cut through massive amounts of regulations. Congress has rolled back 15 different major regulations from the Obama administration. That is going to save Americans as much as $36 billion over time because of the regulatory burden that has been relieved. These are regulations that harmed Americans and wiped out American jobs. Now those regulations are gone.

When people see that Washington is finally taking the right approach to regulation, it gives them confidence. It makes them more optimistic about the future.

A lot of the regulations that Democrats wrote had to do with their war on American energy. Democrats shut down a lot of energy exploration and energy development in America. They shut down attempts to export American energy. They even wrote rules to put the United States at a competitive disadvantage when we tried to develop energy resources overseas.

Republicans have stopped Washington's war on American energy. We are opening up more areas to responsible energy production off of our coasts and in part of Alaska. Our goal should be to make American energy as clean as we can, as fast as we can, without raising costs on American families.

Republicans have put policies in place to restore that balance to America's energy policy.

Now people are talking about not just energy security, energy independence, but American energy dominance. When people see that Washington is finally taking the right approach to energy, it gives them confidence.

People see that Republicans are delivering on other promises as well, such as giving American families serious tax relief. This tax law that passed at the end of last year is giving back more than $1 trillion to Americans over time. It is letting people keep more of their hard-earned money. It is spurring economic growth. It is going to make it simpler for a lot of families to fill out their taxes.

When people see that Washington is finally taking the right approach to taxes, it gives them more confidence, more optimism. They are confident because they are already seeing the direct result in their paychecks.

At least 166 companies have said that they are going to give raises, give out bonuses, and invest more in their workers because of the tax law. More than 2,236,000 workers across this country are getting more money in their pockets as a result of these raises and bonuses. Some of the folks who are getting bonuses are people who work at Walmart. That is one of the biggest employers in my State of Wyoming. People who work there are getting bonuses, they are getting higher wages, and they are getting expanded maternity leave benefits—one advantage after another—as a result of the tax law that was passed by a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and signed by President Trump. These workers are noticing the extra money. It is going to make a difference to them and to their families. It is not just a one-time bump for people; economists say that this tax relief legislation is going to boost the economy for years to come.

There was a story on CNBC Monday that quoted an official from one European bank. He said that President Trump has ''changed the perception of what's possible in Washington.''

The American economy has roared back to life. We are finally—finally—having the economic recovery that we should have had 8 years ago. That is because we finally got the policies that allow our economy to grow the way it should. We had a big recession in this country. Democrats used that as an excuse to pile a bunch of regulations on the American people. That had a lot to do with keeping the economy from recovering at the pace it should have.

During the Obama administration, there was talk about the ''new normal.'' People said that maybe it was just the way things were going to be in America from now on—slow, tepid economic growth, weak recovery, wages that didn't grow, people out of work for years at a time. That is what we saw in that administration. Now we know that it was never normal, it was never acceptable, and it was never the way things had to be. Things could be different, and the American people voted to make things different. In 2016, they said it was time for a change. Republicans are showing that the economy can grow faster once we get the right policies in place. America can be a greater place for all of us.

We head into President Trump's second year with an economy much stronger than it was the day he took office. We have more Americans at work. We have businesses and families confident that the economy will be even better this year. I think that is the kind of thing that people mean when they tell me they feel confident and optimistic in the direction of our country again. I see that confidence in Wyoming. We see it on Wall Street, and we see it all across the United States.

Democrats might miss the Obama economy of higher taxes and more regulation. Republicans are fighting to continue the policies that are giving Americans confidence, optimism, and hope. Republicans know this is just the beginning.

(The remarks of Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 2319 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. 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. WARNER. Madam President, I rise very briefly to thank my friend, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

One more time, I urge all of our colleagues to vote for S. 139, which will be coming up for a vote in a few moments.

This is a critical tool that our intelligence community uses on a regular basis to keep America safe. It is a tool that—as someone who has more, perhaps, observance of this program than most—I do not believe has been abused or will be abused. This legislation includes meaningful reforms on furthering civil liberties protections and making sure that a year from now, the questions that many Members have asked over the years, particularly of the Bureau, will be answered.

I think this foreminded legislation needs to pass and needs to pass with an overwhelming majority.

Again, I thank the chairman for his good work. We had a 12-to-3 vote out of our committee on this legislation. We had a 60-to-38 vote that moved us forward on the cloture motion. My hope is that many other colleagues who care deeply about national security will join us in the final passage of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I thank the vice chairman of the committee, Senator WARNER.

I think what we have seen is a process that has tried to take into account concerns that not just Members but the American people have had with programs that operate in a degree of secrecy, and I think most Americans understand why.

The assurance I have tried to make and the vice chairman has tried to make to our colleagues and to the American people is that we are vigilant in the rigorous oversight of not just this program but of the entire complex of intelligence in the United States. It is our job as committee members, and we do it without the clarity that most members would like to have on issues. I respect the fact that some still disagree with us, though the number is small. I also feel extremely proud today that we are getting ready to, in the next few minutes, reauthorize the single most important intelligence tool that exists for us to keep the American people safe.

I think we will look back on this as a needed tool. Today, the threat landscape looks worse than it probably ever has. The reason Americans can safely go to bed at night is that there are a lot of dedicated folks to whom we provide tools in order to keep them safe. It starts with a vote in this body, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote, when given the opportunity shortly, to reauthorize the 702 program.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1870

Madam President, I move to table the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to accompany S. 139.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Peters
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reed
Burr	Hassan	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Carper	Heitkamp	Rounds
Casey	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Schumer
Collins	Johnson	Scott
Corker	Jones	Shaheen
Cornyn	Kaine	Shelby
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Stabenow
Cotton	King	Thune
Crapo	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cruz	Lankford	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Feinstein	Nelson	

NAYS—34

Baldwin	Harris	Paul
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heller	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Smith
Brown	Leahy	Sullivan
Cantwell	Lee	Tester
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murkowski	Wyden
Gardner	Murphy	
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL S. 139

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 98, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) was agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 165, S. 1519.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 165, S. 1519, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each until 7 p.m., with the time equally divided, and that all quorum calls during that time also be equally divided.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

PROTECTING LIFE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I want to get a chance to address an ongoing conversation that is happening in Washington, DC, right now and will be over in the next 36 hours. As unusual as this may sound, with all of the drama that is happening here, just outside this building there are tens of thousands of people—most of them students—who are gathered in Washington, DC, preparing for something called the March for Life. This has happened for decades now. Students and adults come from all over the country to Washington, DC, to quietly speak

for those who cannot speak for themselves—children still in the womb—and to be able to speak out for the protection of life.

It is an interesting conversation that has a tremendous amount of science, a tremendous amount of faith, and a tremendous amount of heat around it, as some individuals don't want to discuss the issue of abortion or would simply say: That is a woman's choice; we need to set that aside and ignore it.

There is a whole group of students who arrive here saying: Wait a minute. That child in the womb has 10 fingers and 10 toes, unique DNA that is different from the mom and different from the dad. The child feels pain in the womb and has a beating heart. That doesn't sound like tissue to me; that sounds like a child.

They are raising great issues that, quite frankly, science reinforces as well.

Last week, I had the opportunity to be able to stop by one of the great research facilities in Oklahoma. They are doing tremendous research on cancer, on MS, on Alzheimer's, and a lot more. I stopped by one of the labs and talked to one of the scientists there. They are actually doing research on zebra fish.

Now, as odd as this may sound, they are actually taking zebra fish eggs and developing those eggs. As they are first beginning to hash out of the eggs, they are injecting them with a gene that they know to be cancerous in humans, allowing that to be able to develop in the zebra fish and seeing the abnormalities there. Then, they try to treat it with different drugs to be able to see if once they get the abnormalities, they can reverse it. They are literally taking the zebra fish, creating problems, and seeing if they can fix them.

They are going into great detail. The microscopes, the work, the millions of dollars that have gone into this research are all for one simple thing—the ability to be able to cure diseases that affect human life.

As a culture, we have determined that life is valuable. Human life, especially, is valuable and precious. The challenge that we have is determining when that life begins. I and millions of others believe that life begins at conception, when that child has a different DNA than the mom or the dad. That tissue is not just the mom's tissue at that point; it is growing independently. There is no difference in that child in the womb and the child that is in the backyard playing, laughing, and going down the slide, other than time. There is no difference.

Last year, Cleveland Cavaliers' guard J.R. Smith and his wife had little Dakota. When I say ''little Dakota,'' I mean little Dakota. She was born at less than 1 pound at 19 weeks of development. She left the hospital 5 months later at 7 pounds, 4 ounces—7 pounds, 5 ounces, actually.

When she left the hospital, it was a remarkable event. It was celebrated all over social media—this guard with the NBA Cleveland Cavaliers and this beautiful child leaving.

Dakota is now 1 year old, and it has been interesting the stir that happened around her birth as a lot of people stopped and thought about a child that small and that young. It was interesting. The CNN articles that came out at the same time as little Dakota's birth noted that a child at 23 weeks of development has a 50 to 60 percent chance of survival now. Science has changed a lot over the last several decades. A lot has happened. It is remarkable to hear the stories of surgeries that are happening in utero.

In 1995, Roberto Rodriguez actually went through surgery still in the womb. He had major problems in his left lung, and at 20 weeks, they went in and did surgery in utero, fixing his left lung. It allowed him to finish out his term, and 13 weeks later he was delivered healthy. Little Roberto Rodriguez is now 22 years old.

This technology is not new anymore. In many ways, the science has far surpassed what were our conversations here in America dealing with policy around children.

Back in 1970, when the Supreme Court passed Roe v. Wade, they had this whole conversation about viability and that government has a right to be able to step in and protect children at the moment that they are viable. Well, in the 1970s, that was very different than what it is now. Now we see children at 21, 20, 22 weeks of development being born and being natural, healthy, great children. We need to be able to catch up in law.

We may disagree on a lot of things on life. As I have already stated, I believe life begins at conception. In this body, I know there are a lot of conversations, saying: How do we actually get to a sense of commonality and common ground on these issues.

Well, let me just lay down three different areas where I would say that maybe we could find some common ground on these three areas. Though we may disagree on when life begins, can we at least agree that Americans have the freedom of conscience? Can we at least agree on the late-term abortions, when a child is clearly viable? And can we at least agree that when a child is born alive, they should be protected? Let me just hit those three very quickly.

The first one is just basic freedom of conscience, allowing an individual to be able to live out their conscience. I spoke to several nurses just a few months ago. When those nurses were hired at the hospitals they worked in, they told the individuals in HR and the physicians they worked with that they believed life begins at conception and they had a moral and conscience belief that they wanted to protect children. They were told at that moment: You will not have to participate in abortions. We understand your conscience belief, and we will protect your conscience belief. For years, they did not. Then, suddenly, they ran short in nurses at one moment, and they pulled each of them in at different times and in different hospitals and in different States. They told the stories that they had been pulled into a procedure, being told on the way in: We need you in this procedure—arriving only to find out it was an abortion they were being forced to assist with. They were appalled to be part of the death of a child rather than protecting the life of a child. Each of them was told: You will lose your job if you don't participate in the taking of this child's life. That is an unfair place to put them in.

Individuals should be able to have the freedom of conscience and should be able to live out their moral and spiritual beliefs. I would never go to an abortion doctor and force him to peacefully protest against his own abortion clinic. That would be absurd. But for some reason, pro-abortion hospitals see no issue in at times compelling a staff member to participate in something they find objectionable, even when they made their stance clear.

We should never force a person to administer a lethal injection in a prison if they have a moral objection to the death penalty. That seems only reasonable. We are rightfully furious when a man threatens a woman with firing if she doesn't respond to his advances. No one would say that if she doesn't like his advances, she could just go find another job. But for some in our culture, they want to look away when that same man threatens a woman with firing if she doesn't violate her conscience and help perform an abortion. They are willing to tell her: Just quit and go find another job. What is the difference?

We wouldn't compel a vegan to eat meat at the company barbecue, would we? Why would we compel a person to assist in the taking of a life when they are personally offended by the practice?

The right of conscience should be protected for every person. Religious intolerance is a personal choice, not a legal requirement in America.

Late-term abortions are another area where I think we should be able to find common ground, and we should be able to protect these children. We should agree that elective late-term abortions should be ended in America. This is an elective abortion after 5 months of pregnancy. When the child's nervous system is fully developed, they can feel pain at that point.

We in America, because of the pro-abortion lobby and the activists who are around them, have lost track of this simple fact: We are one of seven nations in the world that allow elective abortions after 22 weeks of gestation. In fact, of these seven nations that allow abortions after 22 weeks of gestation, three of them—Canada, Singapore, and the Netherlands—allow elective abortions only until 24 weeks, just 2 weeks later. But there are only four countries in the world that allow elective abortions at any moment. Are you

ready for this club? There are four nations that are like us: the United States, Vietnam, North Korea, and China. That is it. Those four nations allow elective abortions at any stage. That is a horrible club for the United States of America to be in. Those countries are some of the worst human rights violators in the world, and that is the elite club in which we find ourselves.

The pro-abortion lobby is so powerful and so wealthy, and they are so engaged, they are not willing to relent that even one child's life could be protected, even when they are clearly viable, leaving the United States in this horrible collection with Vietnam, North Korea, and China on abortion policy. At 5 months old, a child in the womb can kick, stretch, yawn, smile, suck its thumb, and feel pain. It is a viable child.

Late-term abortions represent only 1.3 percent of all abortions in America. I would contend we should stop this practice altogether. There are 191 nations that don't allow this—191 nations. There is no reason we should not as well.

This is interesting. The Washington Post heard several people quote that statistic about seven nations are the only nations that actually allow any abortions at this late stage. Those three that I mentioned—the Netherlands, Canada, and Singapore—allow them up to 24 weeks but not after that. So they ran their famous Fact Checker on this issue. The Washington Post ran through all of it and looked at it and said: This sounds like this is not correct. They ran through the whole study, looked at it, fact-checked the whole thing, and at the end of it came back and said: No, it actually is correct. What seemed a dubious statement in the beginning they fact-checked and gave what the Washington Post calls their elite Gepetto qualification—that means no Pinocchios; true statement.

We should be able to resolve this. I have made no secret that I believe that life begins at conception, but I would say to this group that not everyone agrees with me on this, but we should at least be able to protect life when it is viable.

Let me add one more detail to this that is painful to even discuss. Of those late-term abortions that occur—those 1.3 percent of abortions that occur during this late time period—the child is too large and too well developed to actually have a traditional abortion procedure, so the abortions are done by the abortion doctor reaching in with a tool into the womb and literally pulling the child's arms and legs off, allowing the child to bleed to death in the womb and then pulling its parts out a piece at a time. Why do we allow that in America? As I said, 191 other nations do not. All of Europe does not. When is the last time you heard me say our social policy needs to catch up with Europe? We are better than this.

One last statement, because I have some colleagues who want to join me in this conversation. We should be able to agree on a simple principle: that if an abortion is conducted and it is botched and instead of destroying the child in the womb, the abortion doctor actually induces the delivery—in those rare cases, the current practice is, when the child is delivered, everyone in the operating room backs away and allows the child to die of exposure on the table, because they can't actually take the life anymore; it has been fully delivered.

Kermit Gosnell sits in prison right now because, as an abortionist in Philadelphia, he was in the practice of delivering children and then killing them after they were delivered. It is already a crime to physically take the life of that individual, so the current practice is, if they mess up the abortion and deliver instead of destroy, they just allow the child to die on its own, crying on the table. Can we as Congress and as Americans at least agree that it is barbaric to watch a crying child on the table slowly die; that at least at that moment of delivery, we would agree a child is a child when we can see all 10 of their fingers, see all 10 of their toes, and hear their voice crying on the table? This is an issue that shouldn't be controversial. This is an issue for which we should find great compassion.

I would challenge this body, when we deal with conscience and when we deal with late-term abortions and when we deal with children who are born alive, that we find resolution in those areas.

I am aware this is a difficult topic. I understand that for many people, this conversation is painful to even consider and that for the millions of American women who have experienced abortion in their personal lives, this is painful to even consider. But I am also aware that until we talk about these hard issues and resolve them, they will continue to advance.

We are better than this as a nation. Let's prove it in the way we treat our most vulnerable.

With that, I ask unanimous consent for colloquy time with some of my colleagues, and I would like to be able to recognize Senator BLUNT from Missouri.

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

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am here with the Senator from Oklahoma—and we are about to be joined by the Senator from Iowa—to talk about the topic Senator LANKFORD just said is difficult to talk about. When you actually stand up and explain what is going on, it is hard to imagine that we still let these things happen.

I would suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that we could talk about the fact that the minds of people have changed on this issue. Almost all change their minds once we explain the two things the Congress is focused on this year. Polling on this shows that I believe 63 percent of all Americans now believe that these late-term abortions should not be allowed to occur.

As Senator LANKFORD pointed out so well, the countries that allow this to happen are not the countries whose social policies we would want to be aligned with, including China and North Korea, which have a stated purpose of eliminating children for no other reason than just population control, and they wind up eliminating more female children than male children in that process because apparently their belief is that the male child has more economic value going forward. Why would we want to be aligned with countries that look at these issues that way or just simply think the pain should be allowed?

The House has passed the pain-capable bill. Where are we now in the House on the born-alive bill? Is it to be voted on this week, or has it been voted on already?

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the House passed both the pain-capable and the infant protection born-alive bills in prior months. The Senate has yet to take that up, and it is our hope in the Senate to be able to bring that up for real dialogue in conversations in the days ahead.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I think the pain-capable bill was passed by the House in October.

We have thousands of Americans coming this week, focusing on tomorrow, to talk about this issue. These two bills are two of their priorities, but of course their priority is to honor life. The March for Life is designed to do exactly that.

Clearly, the March for Life—now in its 45th year—is not a celebration. It is not an anniversary or a celebration; rather, it is a time to remember that there is a lot that we still need to do to ensure that our society is a society that values every human life no matter how small, no matter how vulnerable, no matter how little capacity that life has to protect itself. And the way that society, I think, has decided to deal with this is looking at things like partial-birth abortion, the description of which was every bit as bad as the dismembering abortions, but Congress stepped forward on that topic. Some people who performed that particular act didn't stop doing it, but they are in trouble when you find out they have done it.

So thousands of people from all over the country—in fact, tens of thousands of people; it is a number that I believe is always underreported. Based on looking at the March for Life crowd and any other crowds we see here, I guarantee that the final number—if you take any of those crowds and look at them, I believe there is a willingness to ignore the thousands of people who come in buses from all over the country, in the worst possible weather more years than not, to stand up and say: We don't want this to happen.

I think young people are increasingly more and more defensive of the idea of

life and more and more offended about the places where we have chosen not to draw the line. How can you possibly justify a baby who is born alive and the process that Senator LANKFORD just described where you can't take that life but you can step back and not do anything to save that life, or the uniquely troubled countries we are involved in that allow developed children—boys and girls, 10 fingers, 10 toes, the ability to feel pain—to inflict that pain on those children at that time.

The American people don't support this. Almost nobody who understands what is going on supports it. But if you are asked in polling, I think, as I said earlier, 63 percent—more than 6 out of 10 Americans—say: How can we be continuing to let that happen?

So supporting those who come here, responding to those who understand this—and certainly the two Senators on the floor here—the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Oklahoma are among the best advocates for life, among the best advocates for getting information out about life, about adoption, about what happens and what our laws allow and the laws of other countries don't allow.

Certainly I will be welcoming the March for Life this year in Missouri and other States. The Vice President last year became the first Vice President in the history of the country to speak to March for Life and made it clear where his views were and where the administration stands.

The missing component here to do the right thing is in Congress itself. We have an opportunity to step up and do that. We need to have this debate on the floor because people, once they enter into this debate, realize it is not a debate that they want to be in, because the wrong side of this is the side where slightly more than a handful of countries allow it to happen, what we allow to happen.

I am pleased to be here on the floor with Senator LANKFORD and Senator ERNST.

I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues from Oklahoma and Missouri, and we will be joined shortly by the Senator from Montana as well.

I am rising today to discuss the importance of protecting and celebrating life.

As I travel across the State of Iowa, I have had the opportunity to hear directly from families whose lives have been changed by the innovative, life-affirming services offered by their local pregnancy resource center. There are so many more stories of vulnerable lives saved all across the country, not just in Iowa but all across the country.

I would like to begin by recognizing the critical, on-the-ground actions of these pregnancy resource centers, maternity homes, and adoption agencies across the country that are changing and saving lives. I want to thank them for all they do.

Since coming to Washington, I have tried to hold Congress accountable to do its part to protect the most vulnerable in our society. The Senator from Missouri has mentioned that we can measure a society, and ours is a great society, but we can do more to protect those who are vulnerable. For example, last January, I introduced legislation to defund Planned Parenthood while protecting women's healthcare centers. As I have stated time and again, taxpayers should not be forced to foot the bill for roughly half a billion dollars annually for an organization like Planned Parenthood that exhibits such disrespect for human life. Despite what they may claim otherwise, Planned Parenthood is not the Nation's preeminent provider of women's healthcare. For example, Planned Parenthood facilities don't even perform in-house mammograms. They don't do that. Community health centers, on the other hand, continue to greatly outnumber Planned Parenthoods. They provide greater preventive primary healthcare services, regardless of a person's ability to pay.

Additionally, last April, President Trump signed my legislation into law that ensures States are not forced to provide entities like Planned Parenthood—the Nation's single largest provider of abortions—with Federal title X dollars.

I am grateful to have worked with Congresswoman DIANE BLACK, a dear friend in the House; my Senate colleagues, who are with me here today; and President Trump to make sure States are not forced to award providers like Planned Parenthood with taxpayer dollars through title X family planning grants.

Another effort my colleagues and I continue to work on is passing Senator GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Children Protection Act in the Senate. Whenever I discuss this bill, I cannot help but share the remarkable story of a very special family from Newton, IA.

In July 2012, Micah Pickering was born prematurely at just 20 weeks postfertilization—the very age at which this bill would prohibit abortions. When he was born, Micah was only—if you can imagine it—about the size of a bag of M&Ms, about the size of the palm of my hand. Yet Micah was still a perfectly formed baby with 10 fingers and 10 toes.

When I first met Micah, he was just a few years old, and he came to visit me in my office. We had a photo of Micah when he was just born. Again, folks, he was the size of the palm of my hand, a little bag of M&Ms. I had that photo in my office. Little Micah ran up to that photo, and he pointed at it and said: Baby.

And we said: Yes, Micah, that is a baby. That is a baby.

Just a few months ago, I had the opportunity to visit again with Micah and his parents in my DC office. I can attest that now at 5 years old, Micah remains a happy, healthy, energetic little boy. Stories like Micah's show all of us that at 5 months, an unborn child is a child—just as Micah would say—a baby.

There is also significant scientific evidence that at 5 months of development, these babies can feel pain. Yet there is no Federal law protecting these vulnerable babies from abortion. As a result, every year in our country, the lives of thousands of babies just like Micah end painfully through abortion. Currently, the United States is 1 of only 7 countries to allow abortions at 5 months of gestation. We are in the company of China and North Korea. Folks, this is unacceptable.

There is much work to be done in the ongoing fight to protect life. We understand that. As folks from across the country travel to Washington to ''March for Life'' this week, I am urging my colleagues to join me in calling for a vote on this critical legislation that recognizes these unborn babies as the children they are and provides them the same protection from pain and suffering that all of our children deserve—again, as Micah Pickering would say, ''a baby.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I would like to ask Senator SASSE to join us for this colloquy as well.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I say thank you very much to the Senator from Oklahoma and thanks to the Senator from Montana for spelling me. I have been sitting in the Presiding chair during this colloquy, so I have not been on the ground floor able to participate, but I would like to associate myself with this colloquy and with the leadership of the Senators from Oklahoma, Missouri, Iowa, and Montana.

I, too, know Micah, and it is an amazing thing. I wish all 100 Senators had a chance to know Micah and his family. I also want to associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Oklahoma, as he began this, that we are one of only four countries in the world that allow elective abortion at any time for any reason. Our peers in this are North Korea, China, and Vietnam, and it is a genuine shame. The American people need to understand that, and this body needs to grapple with that reality.

As the Senator from Missouri said, it is special to be a part of the rally and march over the next 36 hours because the college kids who are coming here understand this far better than the general public. There is a movement in this country to want to respect and celebrate life, and good things are happening generationally with this cause.

I want to associate myself with this colloquy and thank the Senator from Montana for spelling me from the chair. Thank you.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, this is a difficult issue for so many people because it is intensely personal for so many people. We understand full well the grief some families have when this

topic comes up because there are millions of men and women who they know their child has been aborted. We get that. We want to have incredible compassion for them as they struggle through some of the most difficult decisions of their life. We understand that when they go to the mall and they watch a small child laugh in the food court of the mall, they wonder in the back of their head, ''Would that have sounded like my child when they laughed?''

We get the grief they live with for the rest of their life as they process through what some physician told them was tissue, but in their heart they know was a child. This is a nation that can set some basic principles to help those individuals, to promote adoption, to be able to encourage those families and help walk alongside them. We are good at grace and compassion as a nation. We can continue to be better at it. One of the ways we have to be able to express that is for the most vulnerable, for those children who have yet to be born.

I would like to invite the Senator from Montana to also join in this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I thank Senator LANKFORD for leading this very important conversation. I thank Senator BLUNT, Senator ERNST, and Senator SASSE for joining us today as well in this discussion.

Mr. President, 28 years ago, I became a first-time dad. By the grace of God, we got to see three more children born after our first child David was born. I can tell you, my wife Cindy and I were excited and a little bit terrified when we welcomed David into the world.

As a parent, one of the toughest things is to see your child in pain. I remember when David cried, I would have given an arm and a leg to stop that pain. I remember when he was just a little baby taking David to the pediatrician to get that shot and so forth, and the pain David felt and the screams and the crying I think were much harder on the parents than on the baby.

I think we all recognize the pain a child feels after they are born. As I have gone on and researched this issue of pain and babies and so forth, science tells us that a baby feels pain before they are born. Senator SASSE mentioned earlier that we are one of four nations that allows elective abortion at any time during a pregnancy. The question is, if we were 1 hour before delivery—the baby is 1 hour from being delivered—as a nation, can we at least agree that we should have a law that says abortions should not be allowed because it is pretty clear that the baby is going to feel pain? The question is, at what point do we know they feel pain during the pregnancy?

It is shocking to think our Nation loses 13,000 children a year to late-term abortions. We can have the debate about all abortions, but today we are focused on late-term abortions. Thirteen thousand children a year die from late-term abortions. At 20 weeks, these babies can suck their thumb, they can yawn, they can stretch, they can make faces, and science shows these babies are also capable of feeling pain.

Our ears may be deaf to their cries, but we don't have to live in ignorance, not when research and even common sense tells us these unborn children feel pain. In fact, there is a reason unborn babies are oftentimes given anesthesia during fetal surgery. That is why we must pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. It is unconscionable that we are allowing unborn children as old as 20 weeks—that is 5 months—to be killed when they can feel pain. In fact, do a Google search. If you have a smartphone, are sitting in front of a computer, type in ''20 weeks.'' You don't even have to type in ''baby.'' Just type in ''20 weeks.'' Then, take a look at the pictures, the images that come up after you complete that search. This is one of them. In fact, I had my smartphone last night. I said to my staff: I typed in ''20 weeks'' in the Google search, and this is the image that comes up.

How can we say that is not a baby? While much of the media turned a blind eye to the atrocious acts of Kermit Gosnell, and they didn't watch the horrific videos taken undercover at Planned Parenthood clinics, many of us did. We did watch, and we cannot sit in silence. Most of us would not wish that treatment on even our most hated of enemies, let alone a child of any age.

The United States is just one of seven countries that allows elective abortions after 20 weeks. It is not a good list to be on. It is the same list we share that has China and North Korea on it. As an American citizen, I believe in our founding principle that all men and women are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As a person of faith, I am called—we are called—to help the most vulnerable in our society. As a U.S. Senator, it is my honor to support this legislation, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and I urge its swift passage.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, there has just been a dialogue—a colloquy—here on the floor. I thank Senator DAINES from Montana, Senator BLUNT from Missouri, Senator ERNST from Iowa, and Senator SASSE from Nebraska for joining in a dialogue of this basic issue of life.

In 1973 this week, Roe v. Wade was passed by the Supreme Court in a split decision. We are still having this dialogue, and there is still an ongoing argument about looking into the womb. We know a lot more now—about times now—than they knew in 1973, and we know a lot more about the development of a child now than they knew in 1973. We are still having this ongoing debate that, I think, is a righteous debate, quite frankly. I think it is entirely appropriate for us to be able to talk about these kinds of difficult issues and try to find some resolution. The American people have these dialogues, and we should have them here and be able to bring the debate to the forefront.

This is not about people whom we hate. It is always interesting to be able to get the dialogue and pushback from people who say: You just hate people because of whatever reason. It is not true. It is, actually, that we love children. That is really the issue. There is a vulnerable child in the middle of this conversation, and sometimes they don't seem to come up in the conversation about protecting rights or about giving people privacy. All of those things are wonderful euphemisms, but in the middle of that, there is a very small child who is being discussed. We are trying to elevate their voice—to literally speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. We think that is an appropriate role for government—to speak out for the most vulnerable and see if we can find justice for those individuals.

This week is not only the week that we have the anniversary of Roe v. Wade; it is also the week that we celebrate Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. I would say that he is a terrific role model in this conversation. His basic teaching is that hate doesn't win over a friend, that only love can do that. Only love can transform an enemy into a friend. That is what we are trying to do.

To the people who oppose this idea, we get it. We can have that dialogue. They are not our enemies, though. Quite frankly, we want to respond to their comments in love and say, ''Let's sit down and have a reasonable dialogue. Let's express our affection for children,'' and be able to talk about how valuable they really are in our society. Let's talk about adoption. Let's talk about ways to be able to continue to take care of them. In the middle of it, let's talk about a child as a child, not just as tissue that is random, because tissue that is just random doesn't suck its thumb and smile back at you. It doesn't stretch and yawn. It is a child who does that. We want to be able to have that conversation.

I would urge this body to stop ignoring what millions of the American people see as the issue. Let's talk about the child, and let's see where we are going to go. I think a good first step for us to be able to talk about this is with the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, what we call the pain-capable bill, which deals with late-term abortions—very late, 5 months and later—and the issue of conscience.

Are we really going to compel people to perform procedures they find morally reprehensible in the destruction of a child rather than in the protection of a child? We should be able to find common ground on those.

Let's then keep the conversation going because it is a reasonable thing

for us to be able to discuss. If we cannot talk about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in this place, where can we talk about it?

Again, I thank my colleagues for participating and for their tenacity and their compassion and their affection for all Americans whether they agree or disagree on this issue. I appreciate very much their engagement.

I appreciate very much the volunteers who are scattered around the country right now who are serving women in some of the most difficult moments of their lives at crisis pregnancy centers, at women's resource centers, and other locations. They are volunteering; they are providing clothes; they are providing help; they are providing sonograms and pregnancy tests; and they are walking those families through those tough days. Thanks to those volunteers as well today, wherever they may be, and bless them for the ongoing work that they do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, access to healthcare is on the line today for 24,000 Montana children. The House of Representatives is working to pass legislation that will reauthorize a program called the Children's Health Insurance Program, better known as CHIP, for 6 years and will keep the government open. If passed, it will then come to us for a vote.

Why don't we take the opportunity before us to come together on issues we agree on instead of always fighting on what divides us? I think we can all agree on keeping Montana kids healthy.

Let me tell you a story about a family from Helena, MT, the A-Gee family.

Jaxon was a normal baby—a happy, healthy baby—until October of 2016, when he was just 8 months old. That is when he was first flown from Helena to Missoula's Community Medical Center's Pediatric Intensive Care Unit. He was deathly ill with a respiratory infection.

At that time, it was not clear why Jaxon had gotten so sick, but his parents soon learned that he had Leigh syndrome, a disease in which the body is not able to process energy properly, which leads to muscle weakness, swallowing problems, and severe illnesses with just a simple or a common cold. His parents quickly learned to manage his new feeding tube, to suction his mouth and his throat, and to put him on oxygen monitors at night.

Unfortunately, Jaxon has had five more serious infections. Each time, he has become ill. It has happened so quickly that he has had to be flown to Missoula even though he has a team of pediatricians, nurses, dietitians, speech therapists, and physical therapists who are trying to help keep him from getting ill.

As Jaxon's mom would say, when Jaxon gets ill, the only way to keep him from having to be flown to Missoula is to get him seen by his pediatrician as soon as possible so that if he does get sick, it is relatively minor.

I can tell you that this family in Montana is grateful for Healthy Montana Kids, which is Montana's CHIP program. They are thankful for its providing Jaxon's insurance and the copay for his care and his medical supplies. His mom says that the insurance is what makes it possible to manage Jaxon's condition and possible to afford well-baby checks instead of their just going to the doctor's on an emergency basis.

To add more background to the story, Jaxon's dad was disabled in a workplace accident, so he is home, caring for Jaxon and the family's other two children. Jaxon's mom works, and her employer has been phenomenal to her—those are her words—as they have faced Jaxon's hospitalizations, but the family of five couldn't afford Jaxon's care without Healthy Montana Kids. A helicopter bill for the ride from Helena to Missoula alone can be as much as $34,000, and Jaxon has taken that flight six times.

This family doesn't know what it will do if the funding for CHIP runs out, but the family is committed to caring for its son no matter what. That is why I support a 6-year reauthorization of CHIP.

Let me provide another reason.

This is Danielle. She is 9 years old, and she lives in Deer Lodge, MT. When she was just 18 months old, she suddenly lost the ability to walk.

Cindy and I are the parents of four children. I cannot imagine a more frightening moment as a parent if one has an 18-month-old child, and he suddenly loses his ability to walk.

Danielle was diagnosed with a form of juvenile arthritis. You don't think about arthritis affecting an 18-month-old child. This is a disease that causes pain, swelling, a stiffness of joints, as well as vision problems.

Thankfully, Danielle was started on a medication—a twice-a-month injection that controls the swelling and inflammation. Because of that, she can walk and even run again. Yet these injections are expensive. To pay outright for just 1 month, it costs over $6,000. Last summer, for 3 months, Danielle was unable to get the injections. She stopped walking, and she no longer could go to school. Her mom had to carry her through the house.

When Danielle was approved for Montana's CHIP program, she was able to go to the doctor's and get on another medication—an infusion this time. She is now back at school and running around—to quote Mom—''like a kid who doesn't have any problems.'' Danielle loves to study math and science, and when she grows up, of all things, her dream is to be a doctor for kids. Without CHIP, Danielle's family would be unable to afford the medication she needs. Without CHIP, Danielle wouldn't be walking.

Danielle and Jaxon and the thousands of other Montana kids and their families need us to work for them. So I am saddened that partisan politics would get in the way of access to healthcare for these children. We have the opportunity today to reauthorize CHIP for 6 years and avert a government shutdown at the same time.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing here, to do the right thing for the 24,000 Montana kids who use this important program. I urge them to support a 6-year reauthorization of CHIP and to keep the government open.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Vermont.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, we are at a pivotal moment. If the Congress does not get its act together by tomorrow, there will be a government shutdown. A government shutdown will be extraordinarily destructive to the people of our country, millions of whom depend upon government services. It will be destructive to millions of Federal employees who keep their families going with a paycheck from the government. It will be destructive to the U.S. Armed Forces, men and women who put their lives on the line to defend us. So it seems to me that we have to do everything we can to prevent a government shutdown.

As everyone knows, we have a Republican Party that controls the U.S. Senate, a Republican Party that controls the U.S. House of Representatives, and a Republican who is in the White House, President Trump. We are now 3½ months into the fiscal year, and the Republican Party has yet to give us an annual budget.

The U.S. Government is a $3 trillion operation. There is no business in this country of any size that can run week to week, month to month. We need an annual budget, and now the Republicans are coming back, asking for a fourth continuing resolution. You cannot run a government like that. It is unfair to the American people, unfair to the Armed Forces, unfair to all of us.

Three and a half months have gone in the fiscal year; yet the Children's Health Insurance Program has not been reauthorized. This is a program that has existed for decades with bipartisan support. How can we not reauthorize the CHIP Program?

Three and a half months of the fiscal year have come and gone, and we have not reauthorized the Community Health Center Program, which provides primary healthcare, dental care, mental health counseling, low-cost prescription drugs to 27 million Americans

in every State in this country. If legislation were brought to the floor of the Senate today, the Blunt-Stabenow bill reauthorizing the community health centers, I suspect, would get 70, 75 votes; yet Republicans, after 3½ months, have not been able to reauthorize the CHIP Program or the Community Health Center Program.

When we talk about the budget process, we are talking about three major issues; there are more, but there are three major issues. No. 1, will we continue to have parity in spending between defense spending and nondefense spending? Since 2011, in four different budgets, there has been a bipartisan agreement that for every dollar spent on defense is a dollar you will spend on the needs of a struggling middle class, millions of people who are struggling every day to keep their heads above water economically—a dollar here, a dollar there. That has been agreed upon on four separate occasions, but several weeks ago, the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, came to the floor and said: We want to do away with that parity. We want to be able to spend more on the military and less on the needs of working families.

We have a middle class that is shrinking. We have people all over this country working two or three jobs. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any other major country on Earth. We have millions of elderly people who can't make it on $12,000 or $13,000 a year. We have a crisis sweeping the Nation, hitting my State of Vermont very hard. We have infrastructure that is crumbling. We cannot ignore the needs of the working families of this country and spend huge amounts of money only on the military.

Some of the things we have to do as we come together, as we must, for a bipartisan agreement is, of course, reauthorize CHIP and, of course, reauthorize the Community Health Center Program. The Stabenow-Blunt bill has nine Republican cosponsors. Every Democrat will support it. We have the votes. Let's do it.

We have to deal with the pension issue. One and a half million American workers are about to lose 50 to 60 percent of the pensions they were promised by the U.S. Government. That cannot be allowed to happen. We have to stand with those workers.

I went to a meeting earlier today dealing with the Social Security Administration. The Social Security Administration provides a process—the administrative arm makes sure that the elderly, disabled, and people who get Social Security benefits get those benefits in a timely manner. For years now, Republicans have underfunded that administration, and today there are simply not enough employees to do the work that has to be done. Amazingly enough, over at the House they are talking about massive cuts to the Social Security Administration on top of all the cuts they have already received.

The Washington Post wrote an article a few weeks ago—unbelievable—and what they said is that over the last year, if you can believe it, 10,000 people with disabilities who had applied for Social Security benefits died while waiting for those claims to be processed. They were not processed in a timely manner because the Social Security Administration does not have the workers it needs and has been significantly underfunded. For the sake of the senior citizens of our country, for the sake of the disabled, any budget agreement when we have parity must supply sufficient amounts of money for the Social Security Administration so that they can do their work.

Every Veterans Day, every Member of this body talks about how much they love veterans. The Veterans' Administration today has 30,000 vacancies, which means that our veterans are not getting the quality and timely care that they must be able to receive. We have to start filling those vacancies. Any budget agreement must include increased funding for the VA.

In my State of Vermont and all over this country, there are millions of young people who went to college, went to graduate school, and have left school deeply in debt. Because of high interest rates, some of those people now owe more money today after paying off, year after year, their debts than they did when they took out the debt. We have to address the debt crisis facing some 40 million Americans.

In Vermont and all over this country, if you are a working person, what do you do if you have a 3-year-old or a 2-year-old? Well, you look for decent, quality childcare. But all over this country it is extremely difficult to find that quality childcare. Any serious budget agreement we reach must include increased funding for childcare so that working people in this country know, when they leave their kid at a center, that child will receive quality care at a cost that is affordable. Every dollar we invest in early childhood education is a dollar very, very well spent.

All over this country, in this, the wealthiest Nation in the history of the world, we have infrastructure—roads, bridges, water systems, waste water plants—which is crumbling. In many parts of rural America, including the State of Vermont, we do not have high-quality, affordable broadband or cell phone service. How do you maintain a community, how do you bring business into a community, how do kids do their homework if you don't have decent broadband or cell phone service? We have to invest in rural America and make certain that every community in this country has broadband and the kind of infrastructure that it needs in order to prosper.

One of the tragedies taking place in this country today is resulting, unbelievably, in a lowered life expectancy rate here in the United States of America. Our life expectancy rate is actually in decline, and one of the reasons for that is the tragic opioid and heroin epidemic, which claimed some 60,000 lives last year. We cannot ignore that problem. We have to invest in prevention. We have to invest in treatment. We have to help States all over this country and the families who are struggling with this issue.

My point is, we need parity, not for some abstract, inside-the-beltway reason; we need parity in spending because we need more in this country than just a strong military. We need a strong middle class. We need a strong working class. We cannot turn our backs on tens of millions of people who are struggling.

The second issue that we have to deal with here in the Congress is the issue of DACA and the need for clean Dreamers legislation. In September, President Trump initiated a very serious crisis. What he did is rescind President Obama's Executive order providing legal status through DACA to 800,000 young people. These are young people who were raised in the United States of America. These are young people who today are working. They are in school; they are in the military. This is the only home they have ever known. This is the only country that any of them or many of them can even remember. The idea of simply doing away with the legal status that they have, subjecting them to deportation, subjecting them to being taken away from the only country they have ever known and loved is literally beyond comprehension and unspeakable.

In September, when Trump initiated this process by rescinding Obama's Executive order on DACA, he said to the Congress, the Republican leadership in the House and Senate: You fix it. Get legislation.

Well, there are people right now—Senator DURBIN, Senator GRAHAM, and others—who are working on legislation, which doesn't go as far as I would like it to go, but they are working on serious legislation in the House. The vast majority of Democrats and many Republicans understand that we cannot turn our backs on these young people. That is not just what we feel here in the House and in the Senate; it is what the American people want. Poll after poll shows that 70, 75, 80 percent of the American people say: Provide these 800,000 young people with legal status. Provide them with a path toward citizenship. Very few people think that we should turn our backs on these young people, let DACA expire, and subject them to deportation. Let us do what the American people want us to do, and let us pass a strong Dreamers Act.

Last but not least, we had some terrible hurricanes some months ago. They brought a lot of disaster to Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Months have gone by, and we have yet to pass the kind of disaster relief that communities in those States and territories desperately need.

We cannot continue to kick the can down the road. We cannot continue to

run a $3 trillion government on a month-by-month basis. It is unfair to everybody. We have to sit down and negotiate a serious budget agreement. And what Republicans must understand is that, yes, they have a 51-to-49 majority here in the Senate, but you need 60 votes to pass this type of legislation. You need 60 votes, and that means you cannot do it alone. You cannot give the Democratic caucus a fait accompli and expect Democrats to say: Oh, yes, sir, we are going to follow you. This requires bipartisan discussion on the parity issue and domestic spending and bipartisan discussion on DACA.

We have a strong majority of Members of the Senate who support a Dreamers piece of legislation and a path toward citizenship. We have a strong majority of the American people and a strong majority of Members of the Senate who want disaster relief. This should not be a difficult problem. The American people want a resolution, and they want it done in a bipartisan way. Let's do it. Let's not kick the can down the road. Republicans must understand that they must negotiate in a bipartisan way.

With that, I yield the floor and 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. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA CRIMSON TIDE FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2018 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYOFF NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my congratulations to the University of Alabama's Crimson Tide on the 2018 College Football Playoff National Championship victory against the University of Georgia Bulldogs.

I join the University of Alabama, the Crimson Tide Faithful, and the entire State of Alabama—my State—in commending this team on its hard-fought win and for showing perseverance in the midst of adversity time and time again. This year, the Tide overcame a host of injuries and midseason struggles to reach this achievement. The team even had to overcome, as the Presiding Officer will recall, a 13-point deficit in the second half of the championship game in Atlanta, winning ultimately 26 to 23 in the first overtime in a college football playoff national championship game. What a game.

Under Head Coach Nick Saban's leadership, the Crimson Tide fought to earn its fifth national title since 2009—demonstrating, I believe, nearly 10 years of dominance. This year's team, among other things, won various awards.

Minkah Fitzpatrick, who is a safety, won the Bednarik Award for best defensive player in the Nation and the Thorpe Award for best defensive back in the Nation. He was also named Associated Press First Team All-American.

Bradley Bozeman, an offensive lineman, was named AP Second Team All-American.

Jonah Williams, an offensive lineman, was named AP Third Team All-American.

Additionally, five players on the University of Alabama's football team were named First Team All-SEC.

Head Coach Nick Saban has now won six college football national championships, equaling the record of former Alabama football Head Coach Paul ''Bear'' Bryant. The Crimson Tide coaching staff has helped produce high-caliber student athletes and gentlemen. This team has brought great pride to the University of Alabama, the loyal fans of the Crimson Tide, and to the entire State of Alabama.

I would like to take a minute to thank Crimson Tide Head Coach Nick Saban, Athletic Director Greg Byrne, President Stuart Bell, and Chancellor Ray Hayes for their leadership.

Mr. President, at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 375, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 375) congratulating the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team for winning the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 375) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, constituents of mine are hearing today that there is a looming government shutdown—Friday at midnight; that if Congress hasn't passed a spending bill, it is possible the government could shut down. That would be a big mistake. Government shutdowns do not make sense.

We have legislation called End Government Shutdowns, by the way, which says that when Congress doesn't do their appropriations bills on time—which is never or rarely—that there should not be a shutdown; rather, continue the spending from the previous year, but ratchet it down over time to give the Appropriations Committee and Congress and the Senate an incentive to get the job done. But let's not shut down the government. When we do that, it doesn't help anybody. It doesn't help us as taxpayers because we end up coming back and paying people, and the inefficiencies of it create more costs. So I hope we are not even talking about that.

In the so-called continuing resolution, which is a short-term spending bill—which, again, is not the best way to govern, but that is what our choice is—in that continuing resolution to keep the government from shutting down, there is also, as I understand it, going to be something that is very good for our country. So, one, shutting down doesn't make sense, but two, let's be sure that the short-term spending bill that we do pass includes something very important—important to about 219,000 children in my home State of Ohio and millions of families around the country who depend on a program called the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP.

CHIP has traditionally been a bipartisan program. It is supported by Democrats and Republicans alike. In fact, the reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP, came out of the Finance Committee with a vote that was unanimous—Republicans and Democrats alike. Again, that doesn't happen often. It happened because people believe it is important to have that safety net program for our kids and for those families.

Right now, that program is really on life support. We are told that if we do not extend that program, some States will begin running out of money even in the next few weeks. One of those States could be Ohio, we are told. The numbers are not exactly accurate, I don't think, because nobody knows. That makes it very unpredictable and uncertain for those families and children. We know there are States running out of money right now.

By the way, the program ended in September, and since September 30, it has been given these short-term authorizations. That doesn't make sense.

My understanding is that the House of Representatives is going to actually put into the continuing resolution that they are going to send over here a longer term extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program—in fact, a

6-year extension, which would be the longest extension ever. I think that is very important.

I heard from some families last week in Ohio who are wondering: Are you guys going to actually provide us with the certainty that our kids can continue to receive the treatment they are getting?

These are children who have serious health problems and who need that kind of care and rely on CHIP to provide it.

For all the disagreements we have in this Chamber—and there are plenty of them—there will be healthy and spirited debate on lots of issues later today, I am sure. This is one on which we can come together and agree that children should have that basic healthcare.

I came to the Senate floor last month—back in December—to strongly urge my colleagues and the leadership on both sides of the aisle to take the politics out of this and get CHIP done, get the long-term authorization done, in the last spending bill. That was not done. In fact, it was just a short-term extension of CHIP that basically coincides with the spending bills. That was disappointing. I said so at the time. It was not done last time. That was a mistake. Now we have the opportunity to do it. Let's take that opportunity. I am here to once again say, let's act to provide that long-term stability in the program.

Again, I am encouraged by what I hear—that the House of Representatives is likely to include that stability to ensure that children everywhere can receive adequate and affordable healthcare. The House 6-year extension would also return CHIP to a traditional Federal-State partnership, which has been a bipartisan effort, and provide additional protections for low-income children and more flexibility for the States.

There are some changes to the program and some reforms to the program that have been bipartisan through committee, and I am hopeful that will be part of it as well.

The House bill that includes this CHIP extension—it would be the longest extension since the creation of the program more than 20 years ago. Instead of these short-term ones, we are going to have a long-term extension, if we can pass this. By doing it long term, the Congressional Budget Office says we will actually save taxpayers $1 billion. Having that predictability and certainty—not having the start-and-stop nature of CHIP—saves taxpayers money.

Is this CR perfect in terms of healthcare? No. There are other things we should do as well. We can do that with regard to the longer term spending bill we will probably be doing a couple of weeks from now or a few weeks from now or whenever we come to the end of whatever the continuing resolution is tomorrow.

We do need to find long-term funding solutions for community health centers, for instance. Again, that has been bipartisan in the past. These centers have been very effective in dealing with issues that relate to our communities, health issues, such as opioid addiction. Community health centers have been very helpful in providing treatment to people, particularly in rural areas that don't have access to other healthcare treatment centers. We should provide them with that long-term funding and certainty.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will vote to extend these important health insurance programs for our children. Again, CHIP stands for Children's Health Insurance Program. It should not be a bargaining chip for other political purposes. Let's get that done. This is a chance for everybody to ensure that we have that certainty for our children and help them to live up to their God-given potential in life.

STOP ENABLING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to talk about another vulnerable group of Americans. This is an issue that doesn't relate to the looming government shutdown or the spending bill that will avoid that shutdown, but it relates to another issue that Congress has the opportunity to address this month.

January is Human Trafficking Prevention Month. Last Thursday was National Human Trafficking Awareness Day. We had a lot of people here in town talking about that issue.

I think everybody in this Chamber would agree with me that we live in a great country. We are blessed to be Americans. In this age of rapid scientific, medical, and technological innovation, we have been able to change the world in positive ways. That is good. But something else is happening that is discouraging; that is, in this country, in the 21st century, we are actually seeing an increase in a part of human trafficking, and that is heartbreaking. This is sex trafficking that is occurring in our country. Often it involves children, underage, who are being sold much like property. Experts tell us that this increase is happening primarily for one reason and one reason alone, and that is because of the internet. It is sort of the dark side of the internet. It is a ruthlessly efficient way to conduct this trafficking business.

This is a stain on our national character. It is something we should all be involved with, Republican and Democrat alike, all of us as Americans, to say: Let's push back. Let's not allow our country, during this period of so many positive technological changes, to use this technology—in this case, online websites selling people—in a way that devastates these families and creates so many dislocations in our communities. Traffickers are using the internet because of the fact that Congress—the House and the Senate—passed legislation 21 years ago that they are able to hide behind. They have immunity under the Federal law called the Communications Decency Act. Ironically, it was actually put in place to push back against child pornography—in other words, to protect children from viewing pornography. It is being used now to say: Well, we don't have responsibilities as websites even if we knowingly are selling children online. Can you imagine that?

Our legislation to deal with that is something we have been working on for a couple of years. We had a 2-year investigation on this online trafficking. It focused a lot on one website—an evil website that sells people online and knowingly has been providing ads out there for underage girls and boys—backpage.com. As we looked into it and did more research, it became clear that even though they were doing this and even though there were people suing them because of it, none of the lawsuits were successful—whether from prosecutors or victims, whether criminal suits or civil suits—because of this immunity they were claiming under Federal law.

We found out that backpage.com—this one website—was responsible for about 75 percent of all child trafficking reports that the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children was receiving. In other words, the great majority of this was happening on this one website. We found out there has been a dramatic increase in trafficking because of this ruthless online efficiency.

When we got through our investigation, we also found out that this website actually knew that some of these ads were related to children and yet published them anyway. They went so far as to try to, as they called it, ''clean'' the ads for illegal transactions. Someone would place an ad, pay for the ad, and then backpage would say: You need to change this ad a little bit because you are using words like ''schoolgirl'' or ''cheerleader,'' which indicates they are underage.

In other words, they knew these kids were underage. Yet they edited the ads and placed the ads anyway and took the profit. That is what we are up against.

The cost to these families, the human suffering that results from this, is incalculable. I met with victims all around the State of Ohio and some from other States who have come here, as they did last week for this rally. Can you imagine being in that situation as a parent?

Kubiiki Pride, who was here last week, had her 14-year-old daughter go missing. She was a teenager. Her mom was stricken with grief and concern over her. After 10 weeks, she couldn't find her anywhere. Finally, somebody said: You ought to look on this website called backpage because they are selling girls online. God forbid, they were right, and she found her daughter. She

found several photographs of her daughter—not photographs she wanted to see, but on the other hand, there was her daughter alive. She said: My first reaction was relief that she was alive. Then, of course, I called backpage, and I said: I found my daughter. She is on your site. She is 14 years old. Please take her ad down.

Backpage said: Did you pay for the ad?

She said: No, I didn't pay for the ad. That is my daughter. She is 14 years old.

They said: No, we can't take down the ad. You didn't pay for it.

Can you imagine?

She was eventually reunited with her daughter. And there is a film called ''I am Jane Doe'' in which she and other women, mothers and young women, are featured. You can see more about her story and what a brave woman she is because she is now standing up to it. She filed a lawsuit, but the lawsuit was not successful because the judge said there is this immunity.

By the way, the courts that have ruled that these websites are protected by this Federal law have said that Congress ought to do something about that. Most recently, last August, a Sacramento judge dropped charges against backpage, stating: ''If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of section 230 of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitation of others by human trafficking.''

To me that is an invitation for Congress to act, saying: We get it; they are exploiting human beings online, but this Federal law gives them immunity.

This immunity was put in place 21 years ago in an effort to try to ensure that we could have a free internet, and that is very important, but it was never intended to provide immunity to illegal activity like this—certainly not to keep people in the business of sex trafficking.

That injustice is why we introduced our legislation. It is called the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA. I introduced it with Senators BLUMENTHAL, MCCAIN, MCCASKILL, CORNYN, HEITKAMP, and others. Senators THUNE and NELSON took this bill through the Commerce Committee late last year.

We had a spirited debate in that committee, and it ended up coming out of the committee with a unanimous vote. Why? Because after hearing from the victims, after hearing from the experts on both sides, the Senators said: Whoa. This doesn't make any sense. As Senators, it is our responsibility to change this law.

It provides justice for victims of online sex trafficking because they will have the opportunity to sue. It holds these websites accountable that knowingly facilitate crimes. It also helps in terms of prosecutions because the State prosecutors now—the AGs, the local prosecutors at the State level—will be able to have access now to the courts to be able to take on these websites and, again, hold them accountable. The prosecutions, again, have been thwarted because of this immunity.

These are very narrow changes. They don't affect the freedom of the internet at all. In fact, I would argue it helps to ensure a free internet. To take care of these bad actors and by holding these folks accountable, it is going to provide the justice the victims deserve.

It is a fair and commonsense approach, and that is why it has the support not just of the Members I have mentioned but actually, now, 66 or 67 Members of the U.S. Senate. That is out of 100 Members. That is a rare thing to have that kind of support. It has the majority of the Republicans on board. It has the majority of the Democrats on board.

It is a fair and commonsense approach that is going to make a real difference in the lives of the people we represent. It will be effective at curbing this increase in trafficking that we see online. Every day we don't act, there are more women and more children who are being trafficked unnecessarily.

It also has the support of an extraordinary coalition of law enforcement organizations, anti-trafficking advocates, survivors, faith-based groups, civil rights communities, major businesses, and even some members of the tech community that initially pushed back against this legislation. Looking at it, I think many of them realized this is not a defensible position to say we shouldn't amend this Federal law that is providing immunity to these bad actors.

Members of the U.S. Senate who have cosponsored the bill, including colleagues of mine who are in the Senate Chamber this afternoon, are saying: I want to be part of the solution. They are showing some courage, and I appreciate that. People who have really shown courage are these survivors—these children and these women who have been trafficked—and they need our help.

We need 60 votes to pass most things around here. In this case, we will have some objections, apparently, and so having 66 or 67 supporters of this legislation is a key number. It enables us to ensure that we can get this onto the floor and passed on the floor. So why are we waiting? We shouldn't wait. We should move this month, during Human Trafficking Awareness Month, Human Trafficking Prevention Month. We should move because it is the right thing to do for these victims and those who might be victims between now and when we act. It is the right thing to do because it will create a safer and a better and a more just society. Elected officials like us are elected to do just that.

There were hundreds of sex trafficking survivors on Capitol Hill last week, and I met with them. The stories will break your heart. Some were the parents, some were trafficking victims themselves. They have shown great courage by sharing their stories, bringing their tragedy public, and now we owe them the opportunity to get this legislation passed, to ensure that we can protect some of the most vulnerable among us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Indiana.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an issue that is very important to Hoosiers: protecting our unborn children. Right now, Hoosiers from across the State of Indiana are traveling to Washington, DC, to take part in tomorrow's March for Life. This annual event brings together the unsung heroes of the life movement—those who have dedicated their lives to saving innocent children.

Now, despite what is often portrayed in the media, life-affirming principles are supported by a majority of Americans. A poll by POLITICO and the Harvard T.H. Chan School for Public Health showed that 58 percent of Americans—almost three in five Americans—oppose allowing Medicaid funding to be used for abortion.

According to the Quinnipiac University polling, 60 percent of Americans, including 46 percent of Democrats, support Federal legislation limiting abortion after 20 weeks.

I am proud to cosponsor the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This act would protect unborn children at 20 weeks postfertilization—the point at which scientific evidence proves abortion inflicts pain.

It is estimated that this commonsense legislation will save roughly 12,000 to 18,000 babies annually, and it will not apply, incidentally, to cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is at risk.

Before being elected to the U.S. Senate, I sat on the board of directors of Hannah House. This is in Bloomington, IN, where I live. It offers women loving support during pregnancy.

I further spent 2 years as a smalltown attorney in little Paoli, IN, and I offered free legal services for parents who wanted to adopt. So you can see why I am very passionate about helping children find loving homes and helping caring adults become parents. I have seen firsthand, through my own experiences, the importance of advocating for those who cannot advocate for themselves.

The United States is one of only seven countries in the world that allows abortions after 20 weeks. This list includes human rights violators like China and North Korea. This isn't company we want to keep.

During this time, when there is principled disagreement on so many

issues—Republicans disagreeing with Democrats, conservatives disagreeing with progressives, surely, we can come together and take action that a significant majority of Americans want. So I am hopeful this critical legislation will receive a vote on the Senate floor very soon.

Thank you.

I yield back my time.

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. SHAHEEN. Mr. 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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, the Senate and the House right now are struggling to pass yet another short-term continuing resolution to avoid a Federal shutdown at midnight on Friday. For nine consecutive years now, since I have gotten to the Senate, we have begun the fiscal year without regular appropriations bills being enacted into law. If we pass another continuing resolution this week, it will be the fourth continuing resolution for fiscal year 2018. There were three CRs, or continuing resolutions, for fiscal year 2017. This ''government by CR'' is chaotic and it is disruptive. It is inflicting real damage on our Armed Forces, as well as on critical domestic programs that benefit people across this country.

I live in a very small town in New Hampshire called Madbury, and if our board of selectmen in Madbury committed this kind of budgetary malpractice, we would get rid of them.

The fact is that the frantic scramble to pass a new CR by midnight on Friday is yet another manufactured crisis here in Washington. It is a crisis that is completely unnecessary. The Appropriations Committees in both Houses of Congress have completed their work in a thoughtful, timely manner. In this Congress, the House passed all 12 of its appropriations bills out of committee. In the Senate, the Appropriations Committee passed 8 of our 12 bills, and we did that with overwhelming bipartisan support. The only reason we didn't report the other four bills out of committee is because the leadership directed us to stop.

So let's be very clear. This is not about appropriators not being able to get our work done and not being able to agree on what we want to do. This is about the leadership in Congress—the Republican majority—which has refused to allow us to go forward with a regular order budget process. The House, the Senate, and the White House are all controlled by Republicans, and if they wanted to complete the appropriations process in a timely manner, we could have done so, and we could have done it with bipartisan support.

Now, I am especially concerned about the damage that government by CR is inflicting on our Armed Forces and national security. Those of us who serve on the Armed Services Committee were disturbed by testimony from the Chief of Naval Operations, ADM John Richardson, in September of 2016. He said: ''Our ability to achieve true effectiveness and efficiency has been undermined by budget instability, workforce limitations, and eight—now likely nine''—and it was nine—''straight years of budget uncertainty and continuing resolutions.''

I remember when Admiral Richardson came and spoke to the Navy caucus, and we were asking him what his concerns were. He said: Well, you know, my biggest concern is budget certainty, and what we tell everybody in the Navy now to figure on is to figure that they can't do anything in the first quarter of a fiscal year because they are going to be operating under a continuing resolution.

He pointed out: ''This compromises our mission, and drives inefficiency and waste into all that we do.''

In a similar vein, the Army Chief of Staff, GEN Mark Milley, has repeatedly warned us of the damaging impacts that budget uncertainty has on the Army's combat readiness. Training cycles are disrupted, and sometimes they are discontinued. All non-mission-critical maintenance is postponed for the length of a CR.

Now, I share the views of many in this Congress that we need to increase support for our military. We live in an uncertain world, where we are facing security threats from ISIS to Russia and North Korea, and we could go down a long list. We must be prepared to respond, but we can't increase military spending at the expense of funding our domestic needs.

When it comes to funding domestic needs, no challenge is more urgent and frightening than the nationwide opioid epidemic. In my State of New Hampshire, nearly everyone has a heartbreaking story of a family member, a friend, or a colleague whose life has been destroyed by opioids. We can just look at these headlines and see what the challenge is. This is on August 16, 2017, from our State newspaper, the Concord Monitor, in the capital: ''N.H. drug overdose deaths—mostly from fentanyl—continue at a high rate.''

The CDC recently said that New Hampshire has the highest overdose death rate from fentanyl, the third highest in the country. Nationwide, in 2016, more than 63,000 Americans died from overdoses—more than 63,000 people. If we were losing that many Americans to a disease outbreak, to a war in the Middle East or elsewhere, there would be an outcry in Congress and we would pass legislation to address the crisis in a matter of days. Well, this current funding crisis is an opportunity for us to address the opioid epidemic.

In recent weeks, along with my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator HASSAN, I have urged the Senate to make an immediate emergency $25 billion Federal investment in treatment and prevention—a down payment on a sustained, reliable funding stream to support efforts by States and communities. At long last, we could provide a response that is commensurate with the magnitude of this public health crisis.

There is bipartisan support in this body and throughout Congress to address the opioid epidemic. President Trump promised when he was campaigning, and since he became President, that he was going to work to end this epidemic. Yet we are still waiting to see the resources that States and communities need.

Now, last week many of us watched with great anticipation when President Trump invited bipartisan representatives from both the House and Senate, and the television cameras, to talk about how we were going to address the funding situation that we are in, and how we were going to address DACA—those young people who were brought to this country through no fault of their own and are now in a situation where they don't have citizenship and they don't have a way forward.

Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN spent four months negotiating an excellent, bipartisan agreement to strengthen border security and to give Dreamers the path to citizenship that they deserve. The President, in that meeting that we all watched said: Bring me a solution, and I will sign it.

Well, they reached an agreement that would likely pass in the Senate with at least 60 votes. Last week, President Trump applauded the deal. He invited Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN to the White House to finalize it. And when they got there, they were shocked to find that the President had completely reversed himself.

This morning, Senator GRAHAM was stating the obvious when he said: ''We do not have a reliable partner in the White House.''

Well, we do have reliable partners in this body. Give us that bill. Let us vote on it. Let's send it to the President, and let the President veto it if he doesn't like it.

Yesterday, Majority Leader MCCONNELL said: ''As soon as the President figures out what he is for, then I will be convinced that we are not just spinning our wheels but actually dealing with a bill that can become law.''

Well, again, we have a bipartisan deal on DACA. Let's vote on it.

There are very real consequences to the constant chaos, turmoil, and policy reversals that have become the new normal under this President. We must commit ourselves on a bipartisan basis to restoring order to the appropriations process. It is time to fulfill our constitutional responsibility to pass full-year appropriations bills that address the needs of the American people.

As we work to resolve this current fiscal impasse, any agreement should include a number of basic provisions.

We should fund government for the remainder of this year—no more short-term continuing resolutions—enough. It is enough. We need to stop that. The majority of Members in this Chamber and throughout Congress understand that we can't keep doing this. Any deal should increase support for our military, and it should provide parity for our domestic needs: to address the opioid epidemic; for our veterans; for the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers; for those Medicaid payments that are so critical to our rural hospitals; for disaster relief in Florida, Texas, California, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; and for pension relief for people who have worked their whole lives and who are facing old age without the pensions they paid into.

We can get this done. There are enough people of goodwill on both sides of the aisle in this body and in the other body so that we can do this if we are allowed to work together. So Democrats and Republicans, let's get this done. Let's keep the government funded, and let's show the American people that we can work together in the interests of this country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Should the Children's Health Insurance Program be reauthorized? Of course it should be reauthorized. It has a long history of strong bipartisan support. This is a major issue in reaching the point of whether we need to get something passed—and we do need to get something passed so the government doesn't shut down. In regard to the Children's Health Insurance Program being a part of that, this started very early last fall, when the Senate Finance Committee overwhelmingly passed a 5-year extension from that committee, once again stating the strong bipartisan support that the Children's Health Insurance Program has.

Thankfully, it is moving along in the House of Representatives. That body has included a 6-year extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program in the continuing resolution that we have to get through the U.S. Senate. That 6-year extension would be the longest extension of the program since it was created over 20 years ago.

I am sure this is going to be surprising to our constituents, for sure, and maybe even surprising to Members of this body, but this reauthorization of 6 years actually saves $1 billion.

I cannot believe that we are in a situation where people who have said that they support the Children's Health Insurance Program would vote against its reauthorization when the House resolution comes over here, but that is what the leadership of this body is dealing with. The reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program has been elevated in this debate, so people know that those who have been crying for a long period of time about finally having CHIP reauthorized could be in a situation of voting against what they have been pleading for over a long period of time.

My colleague from the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator FEINSTEIN, said: ''Healthcare coverage for kids should be a no-brainer.'' I agree. This Children's Health Insurance Program reauthorization is a no-brainer, both in the value it has for the kids and in saving us money at this point.

Senators WARNER and KAINE from Virginia wrote: ''We ask that you include bipartisan legislation reauthorizing the Children's Health Insurance Program in any upcoming funding legislation.'' Well, it is here for all of those Senators who want the Children's Health Insurance Program reauthorized. This is the opportunity to reauthorize it.

Will you vote against what you have been advocating for a long time—the reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program? In my State of Iowa, 68,792 children—the latest enrollment—are in CHIP and are depending upon Congress to do the right thing. The right thing to do is to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program as soon as possible—which could be today or tomorrow—for 6 years so that we don't have to deal with it for a long period of time.

My fellow Senators, this is a time for statesmanship, not gamesmanship. It is time to vote for a prompt reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

TAX REFORM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak about a tax issue. It was nearly 3 weeks ago that the President signed into law the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. It is the most sweeping reform of our Tax Code in more than three decades. This tax reform provides both tax simplification and tax cuts for the vast majority of taxpayers.

Importantly, the tax reform bill made good on its commitment to provide real relief to small business owners, and that also includes family farmers and ranchers. As one of only three Republican Senators on both the Finance Committee and the Agriculture Committee, it was a priority of mine to represent agriculture and the family farm institution throughout the tax reform debate.

Fair treatment for farmers under tax reform was especially important to me, given the large role agriculture plays in the economy of the State of Iowa. Ag accounts for one out of every five jobs in the State and makes up 33 percent of Iowa's economy. The tax reform bill provided a once-in-a-generation opportunity to make real and long-lasting reforms for farmers, ranchers, and every American working in our agricultural industry.

Broadly speaking, across the board, rate reductions will let Americans keep more of their own money. This will afford farmers the opportunity to reinvest in their operations instead of sending that financial capital to politicians in Washington.

Tax reform legislation expands section 179 of the Tax Code, which helps farmers finance overhead costs. It enables farmers to deduct more expenses in the year they occurred and also expands the availability of cash accounting to more farmers in Iowa and throughout the country. These provisions will allow farmers to invest in the equipment necessary to do the job of feeding the Nation and the world.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act lowers taxes on capital investment and includes a business income deduction, which will help level the playing field between farms that file as corporations and those that file as individuals. More than 94 percent of farms are taxed under the IRS provisions affecting individual taxpayers. The bulk of agriculture producers who operate outside the corporate tax code deserve basic fairness. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act makes sure that those taxed under the individual and corporate tax codes are treated with more equity.

One of the most frequently discussed issues in tax reform discussion is the estate tax, which can force family farms to break up operations to pay the IRS following the death of family members. That doesn't happen at the death of a lot of farmers, but in a few cases it does, and it seems to me to be very unfair to break up a farming operation to pay as a result of the consequence of death. I support a full repeal of this unfair tax, but was pleased that in this tax reform legislation we were able to make significant progress in alleviating its burden on family farmers by doubling the estate tax exemption. This substantial change would let more family farmers pass their hard-earned life's work on to their children, paving the way for the next generation of family farmers.

According to the Iowa Farm Bureau, given the price of farmland, about 30 percent of crop farms in Iowa exceeded the $5 million estate tax exemption in 2016, based on land values. The doubling of the exemption amount will go a long way toward alleviating the nightmare that is the death tax for many Iowa farmers.

I have long advocated for commonsense tax relief measures because they will help Iowa and the Midwest and will make life easier for middle-class Americans.

Farmers' hard work provides the healthy and affordable food that we so often take for granted. We should do everything in our power to support that segment of our economy and create an environment where these small

businesses and hard-working families can thrive and prosper. That is what tax reform will do for farmers, for Iowans, and for all Americans. Whether they are middle-class farmers or middle-class nonfarmers, all will benefit from other provisions of the tax bill, such as doubling the standard deduction, doubling the child tax credit, reducing the 15-percent bracket to 12, reducing the 25-percent bracket to 22, and there are a lot of other features in this bill to benefit not only farmers but also other middle-class families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

DACA AND TPS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, the Dreamers are part of this country. They are America's future. They are helping to build this great Nation, and they need our attention now.

The Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House. One of their principal responsibilities is to pass a budget. We are now 4 months into the fiscal year and we don't have a budget and we are talking about another continuing resolution through mid-February.

A couple weeks ago, we were told on the floor to give it a couple more weeks and we would work some of these issues out, but that time has now come, and we still do not have a budget. We should not be going into February without dealing with the problems of this country. We need a deal on the budget. We need a deal for an agreement on the Dreamers. We have so many issues that need to be addressed. There is no excuse why the Republican leadership has not brought these issues to the floor of the Senate for action.

I want to start, in regard to the Dreamers, by commending the bipartisan work of a group convened by Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN. They have come up with a good plan that addresses key issues needed for a compromise on immigration reform. I was pleased to see they put on their website a summary of the proposed legislation that deals with the Dreamers. It deals with border security, deals with diversity visas, those who are in temporary protective status, and family reunification and migration.

The draft legislation we saw would provide a 12-year pathway to citizenship for Dreamers, with up to 2 years of credit for time with DACA. The qualified Dreamers must have entered the United States by June 15, 2012, when President Obama and the Department of Homeland Security announced the creation of the DACA Program. I think most of us know DACA stands for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program.

Let me just talk a few minutes about the Dreamers. These are individuals who entered our country as minors, when they were brought here by their parents to seek a better life. Under the DACA Program, they were entitled to a 2-year renewable work permit and the ability to remain in this country without fear of deportation. Each one has to go through a criminal background check. They need to be enrolled in school. They must either be high school graduates or in the U.S. military.

In the United States today, we have 800,000 who are registered under the Dreamers. There are about 10,000 in my State of Maryland, and they are contributing half a billion dollars to Maryland's gross domestic product. They are a key part of our economy. They are the next generation of teachers, doctors, engineers, and entrepreneurs. They are going to help build America. Most know no other country but the United States, which is their home, and our values, which make America the great Nation it is.

We are a welcoming country. We are a country in which people have come over the years to build this great Nation. That is America's strength. Let us build on our strength, not run away from it. Are we going to turn our back now on the values that built this country? Are we going to rip families apart? Is that what America stands for? I find that hard to imagine.

At the same time, we would hurt our economy and hurt ourselves. I have met with many Dreamers in Maryland. We had one in my office a few weeks ago who had tears in her eyes. She said: I have an expiration date on my back. She doesn't know what is going to happen when that date occurs. To me—and I hope to all Americans—this country is not a country where someone should have to live under those fears. We need to take action to help the Dreamers.

I have had several roundtable discussions with Dreamers in Maryland. I had them in College Park, Baltimore, and other areas throughout Maryland. Let me just mention two Dreamers I met with. Adam was originally born in Canada. His family grew up in Pakistan. He came to the United States with his parents when he was very young. Becky—who was born in Peru—came here with her parents to the United States. I mention them collectively because they both attend the University of Maryland, College Park.

Our State allows Dreamers to have instate tuition to go to college and get the tools they need in order to succeed. They need work permits because they have to work; otherwise, they never would have been able to get through school. They need a driver's license. Adam explained to me he needed a driver's license to get to a magnet school so he could advance his own education.

That was all possible—the ability to get a driver's license and the ability to work—because of President Obama's Executive order, the DACA Program. Now all of that has been put in doubt because of President Trump's announcement that the program will end. It puts their lives on hold in fear, and they wonder whether they need to go into the shadows of the United States of America.

This is a crisis which was created by President Trump when he announced the end of the DACA Program in 6 months. That will expire in March. President Trump's actions to rescind the DACA Program are wrong. We can correct it. That is what Congress can do and what we must do.

Our university community in Maryland strongly supports the DACA Program. I have heard from the University of Maryland system, Johns Hopkins University, and many other schools in our State. This fall, I received a joint letter from the public school secondary systems of Prince George's County, Anne Arundel County, Howard County, Montgomery County, and Baltimore City. This is what the school superintendents wrote to me:

> Maryland is a national leader in providing students with a world-class education. Essential to our success is our commitment to providing children in our schools with a safe and welcoming environment to learn. Termination of DACA will have direct and damaging effects on the Maryland students who are current beneficiaries.

The schools' letter continues:

> It is a direct threat to Maryland's economic stability and safety, as it will strip students of their ability to work and drive legally, pay taxes, and pursue post-secondary opportunities. Parents who lose work authorizations will face deportation or be moved into a dangerous underground economy, causing financial uncertainty for their families and harmful stress on their children—our students.
>
> In addition, the DACA decision could impact our ability to motivate our youth to remain committed to their education and pursuing college or careers, and will lead to worsening economic hardships of our DACA community.

This is from our school systems in Maryland.

I heard similar concerns from law enforcement officials. Tom Manger, who cochairs the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force and is the police chief in Montgomery County, wrote:

> Our support for a legislative solution for Dreamers is consistent with our longstanding support for bipartisan reform of our immigration system. We support measures allowing law-abiding people to feel safe and secure in their communities, which reinforce trust and cooperation with state and local law enforcement. Beyond the significant contributions Dreamers make to our communities, we are concerned that, absent action by Congress, the Dreamer population will be driven back into the shadows and be hesitant to report crimes and cooperate with investigations. Such an outcome would risk undermining community safety. When Dreamers, and all immigrants, feel safe engaging with local police, all of our communities are safer.

I certainly agree with Chief Manger.

A group similar to the Dreamers are those who are here in temporary protected status, or TPS. There are 437,000 people in America from El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Somalia,

Sudan, South Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. In Maryland, 22,500 people are here from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti. The largest number is from El Salvador. Our TPS population in Maryland exceeds the DACA population. My own State's recipients contributed $1.2 billion to the gross domestic product of my State, so this is a major part of the Maryland economy.

This is a very similar situation to the Dreamers. They get a 6- to 18-month extension. They have been here for decades because the underlying conditions in the countries from which they came still exist. I have been to Central America. I can tell you that it is not safe for people to return to those gang communities. They have the same situation—they know no other country but America. If they are required to go back to the country in which they were born, it will tear families apart. We need to act. We need to act in order to protect this group of citizens.

I want to acknowledge legislation that was introduced. I join my colleagues, Senators VAN HOLLEN, FEINSTEIN, and others, who will provide a legislative fix, S. 2144, the SECURE Act. I am pleased that the outline of the Durbin-Graham compromise immigration legislation includes relief for TPS recipients. The legislation will make changes to the diversity visa lottery program and reallocate half of the annual visas to recipients of TPS. That would amount to about 27,000 visas annually.

Under the draft, TPS recipients would maintain legal status and work authorization while awaiting visas. This would give TPS recipients protection from deportation, work authorizations, green cards, and ultimately a pathway to citizenship. After the TPS backlog is cleared—which could take roughly a decade to do, given the 300,000-plus recipients of TPS in the United States today—the annual visas would be allocated to nationals of priority countries.

In the past few months, the Department of Homeland Security has placed termination dates on TPS for those from El Salvador and Haiti and has extended the deadline for a decision on Honduras. These individuals are at risk. We need to act.

Maryland has a large number of El Salvadorans. I am gravely concerned about what will happen to these individuals—many mixed-nationality families who have been part of American communities for so long. For nearly a decade, El Salvador has consistently suffered per capita murder rates that have been among the worst in the world. In 2016, the people of El Salvador were victims of over 5,200 homicides—an alarming rate of more than 80 per 100,000 and the highest globally. El Salvador has limited capacity to absorb the nearly 200,000 individuals who could be subjected to immediate deportation. We welcomed these individuals to America to save them from danger.

As another example, although Haiti has made important strides toward reconstruction, its capacity to effectively manage repatriation efforts has faced substantial setbacks, including the continuing cholera epidemic and devastating hurricane in late 2016. Additionally, conditions in Haiti were further complicated by two category 5 hurricanes—Irma and Maria, which struck in September. These recent developments exacerbate already fragile conditions in Haiti.

As the Department of Homeland Security's own internal memorandum from April 2017 outlined, an estimated 30 percent of the population—approximately 3.2 million people—suffer from food insecurity, and 40 percent of the population lacks access to fundamental health and nutrition services.

In other words, it is not safe for those individuals to go back to Haiti. They have been here. This is their home. They want to make this their home, and we should give them that opportunity.

Let me conclude by again quoting Becky, one of the Dreamers I met at the University of Maryland, College Park. She said that the best present she ever got was on her 13th birthday when President Obama executed the Executive order that gave her legal status and hope here in America.

Well, we can give her an even better present right now. We can give her the present of Congress acting to provide protection for the Dreamers and for those on TPS so they don't have to worry again and they know they have a home here in America.

I urge my colleagues to pass legislation that will protect the Dreamers and TPS.

Mr. President, I certainly hope we will do the minimum that the Congress of the United States can get done, and that is to pass a budget before the deadline of tomorrow evening.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). The Senator from Hawaii.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, Republicans control every level of the Federal Government. They hold majorities in the House and the Senate. They have the Presidency. Yet the very people—the Republicans—who set the agenda in Washington and have majorities in both the House and the Senate are desperately trying to convince the American people that a government shutdown should be blamed on anyone else but them. Give me a break.

Nobody wants a shutdown except, maybe, the President, who seems to relish a government shutdown as a way of ''shaking things up,'' regardless of who gets hurt. Members of Congress should know better, and Republicans should get down to business and negotiate with Democrats in good faith.

Republicans in the House and Senate have brought us to the brink of a shutdown because they are terrified of the ideological extremists in their own party who reject even the most reasonable bipartisan compromises. They are terrified of a mercurial President, who changes his mind on a whim, who explodes at even the most minor slights, and who has repeatedly said that maybe we need a good government shutdown so he can get his vanity wall. Donald Trump and the Republicans will be held responsible for any government shutdown. They have created this situation, and the American people will hold them accountable.

Democrats have been open and transparent about the things we are fighting for. We are fighting to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP, so 9 million kids across the country can continue to access the life-saving healthcare they need. We are fighting to restore funding to community health centers that serve millions of underserved Americans in rural communities, whether they live in Kansas, Ohio, or any of the other States Trump won. We are fighting to protect the Dreamers who could be deported to countries they know little of because the President unnecessarily and cruelly ended the DACA Program. We are also fighting for parity in funding for defense and domestic spending in any budget deal.

These are not partisan Democratic priorities. If one were to put each of these priorities up for a vote, they would all pass with bipartisan support in the House and the Senate. In fact, we could have passed each of these bills a long time ago. Yet, instead of doing something that would actually help people, the Republicans spent months working as hard as they could behind closed doors to give the wealthiest 1 percent of the people in our country and corporations huge tax cuts. Now they are trying to convince the other 99 percent of the American public that this tax bill was a good deal for them, but that is another story and is another example of misplaced priorities.

In getting back to the matter at hand, which is the urgency of preventing a government shutdown, the House is trying to pass another short-term spending bill that only includes a reauthorization for children's health and not the other important priorities we need to support. The Republicans in Congress are trying to pit communities, children, families, and Dreamers against one another in an attempt to divide and conquer. They are hoping we will support yet another government funding bill that kicks the can down the road because they will have funded children's health, even as, in their bill, they abandon the Dreamers and the rural communities that depend on community health centers.

We cannot allow this cynical Republican ploy to succeed. We need to keep fighting for children's health, for community health centers, for Dreamers, and for parity. I will not vote for any government funding bill that does not include all four of these important and urgent priorities. We cannot leave anyone behind because it is clear Donald

Trump will not keep his promise to protect those we call the DACA kids.

I was at the White House last week when the President looked us in the eye and said on national TV that he would sign a bipartisan compromise on the Dreamers. He barely waited for us to leave the White House before reneging on that promise. Then we all know what happened last week during the meeting with Senators DURBIN and GRAHAM at the White House when he was presented with a bipartisan compromise.

We cannot let the President's irresponsible behavior stop us from fighting for Dreamers who deserve our support and protection, Dreamers like Getsi from Beaverton, OR, whom I met late last month when she traveled to Washington, DC, to fight for the passage of the Dream Act. Getsi's parents brought her to Oregon from Mexico when she was only 4 years old. The journey was long and hard, and Getsi's sister was left behind.

While growing up, Getsi's parents warned her not to talk about her immigration status because even mentioning it to the wrong person could result in their deportations. She lived in constant fear. While growing up, Getsi's parents always emphasized the importance of her obtaining a higher education, and while her mom and dad only completed the 5th and 12th grades, respectively, they instilled a love of learning in their daughter and a deep desire to go to college.

After working hard in high school, Getsi enrolled in Western Oregon University, where she is studying to become a gerontological nurse. Getsi works incredibly hard. She is taking 20 credits a semester. I remember, when I was in college, 15 credits was a lot. She is taking 20 credits a semester, is working full time at an assisted living facility, and has recently become a certified rock climbing instructor. Getsi is scheduled to graduate a year early, in May, from Western Oregon University. After graduation, she is planning to enroll in an accelerated nursing master's program so she can realize her dream of becoming a gerontological nurse practitioner.

When I asked what inspired her to pursue such a selfless career, Getsi talked about wanting to care for people like her grandmother back in Mexico and for her parents as they got older. Without the protections DACA provides, Getsi will lose her work authorization, and if she is not able to work, she will not be able to pay for school and will be unable to pursue her dreams.

When I asked her why she traveled for days to come to Washington to share this message with Congress, her response was very moving. She said:

> I have so many dreams and aspirations, and I urge people here to understand how much these Dreamers have to give to the U.S. We were brought at such a young age, we don't know anything about our homelands. I want to be able to stay in the U.S., to stay with my friends and family—my nieces and nephew—everyone who is looking up to me. I want to prove that my parents' sacrifice meant something.

This is a pivotal moment for Congress. Are we going to do more than pay lip service to Dreamers like Getsi by doing our jobs to protect them and provide healthcare to millions of children and families across the country or are we going to bend to the whims of an unpredictable, mercurial, and unreliable President?

Rather than waiting for the President to make up his mind, I call on the majority leader to recognize that as a separate branch of government, Congress should be a check on the excesses of the executive branch. It is about time the majority leader and Republicans in Congress stepped up to do their jobs.

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. TILLIS. 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. TILLIS. Mr. President, most people who are watching TV or who are watching C–SPAN know we are at a very important place here. We are in a position wherein, at midnight tomorrow night, if Congress doesn't act, we will shut down the government. What does shutting down the government mean? It means a lot of things.

It means there are going to be a number of employees who will be wondering when they will get their next paychecks or whether they will get repaid, depending upon whether we make a decision to pay them for time worked.

It means people who need desperately needed services may be wondering whether they will be able to get those services, and—if, for no other reason, even if the money is there—is the distraction going to slow down badly needed services to a number of people who rely on the Federal Government as their safety net?

It is going to mean our military will wonder whether America will really be behind them anymore because the games we are playing in the Senate are more important than the work they are doing to protect the Nation and to protect our allies. It is going to mean a lot of very negative things that should be avoided. I am going to talk a little bit about it.

What I first want to do is to summarize what we are trying to do—people like me who are going to support the continuing resolution. Now, to be honest with you, I hate the whole continuing resolution process.

When I was younger, there was a time when our family was struggling. My father was doing construction work, and he literally had to borrow money to pay for the materials he needed to actually do the job so that he could pay the bills for the family. The way he did that and the way you still do it today, in struggling families, is that you get these 90-day notes. You go to a banker, you tell them you have a project to work on, and you prove to them that you can pay the money back in 90 days and then you pay them back.

Well, that is how we are running the business of the most important Nation that has ever existed. A 1-month CR, a 3-month CR, or a 12-month CR is not the way you run the greatest Nation on the face of the planet. It has a number of problems with it, not the least of which is that you can't give the military any certainty to know what they can invest in for the next new generation weapon or defense system, because they simply don't know if the money will be there for them to make that investment. It means that we are getting far less production for our dollar, we are inefficient, and we are sending a message to the world that we are not serious about the long-term investment that we need to make for our safety and security.

It also affects a number of other agencies, but I think this is very important in these times with all the heightened threats across the world. If we send a message that we are not here for the long term and we are not willing to make those long-term investments, that is a bad message to send. That is the problem with CRs versus what we call regular order—to sit down, negotiate appropriations, pass appropriations bills, and give the men and women in uniform, give the government employees, and give the people who rely on our safety net some certainty. That is our job.

That is why I support a bill that Senator HELLER is proposing. It is called the No Budget, No Pay Act. I think the Senate Members and the Members of the House should not get a paycheck when they fail to do their job. Doing their job means they pass appropriations bills, they pass a budget, and they actually do the job they swore they would do if they won a race for the Senate or the Congress. I hope that bill gets a debate on the floor. I look forward to supporting it when it does.

Let's go back to the CR. The CR is simple. It is 4 weeks long. All it really does is to make sure that we have funding for our servicemembers. It makes sure we have funding for our veterans. It makes sure we have funding for the CHIP program. It actually authorizes it for several years. It gives certainty to States and to people who need support that it is going to be there. It also provides funding for small business loans and funding for the National Institutes of Health. It does a number of other things, but those are critically important.

We have some Members who are trying to negotiate a deal for the DACA population. DACA is the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. It is a program that President Obama put into

place in 2012. It is actually something that I have been working on since we filed the bill in August—and long before that—to try to get reasonably minded Members on both sides of the aisle to come up with a solution that makes sense. But now we have people who actually want to shut down the government because we haven't reached a bipartisan agreement that I think is not that far away. The problem that I have with that is that I think it is going to create a toxic environment in Washington, DC, that is not only going to provide all the uncertainty that I talked about on the prior slide, but it is even going to alienate people who are coming to the table trying to negotiate a bipartisan agreement. Now we are at a point where we are trying to figure out if we can fund the government either through a vote sometime tomorrow or if there will be a shutdown tomorrow night.

I have only been here for about 3 years, and I have been in politics for 12 years. I find it interesting how things change overnight, how things that were untenable or awful just a couple of months or a couple of years ago are justified today based on the disagreement we have on the DACA deal, which I am convinced we will get done before the March 5 deadline, and I hope sooner than that because there are a lot of good kids who came to this Nation through no fault of their own, through a decision made by an adult, who deserve a path to citizenship, who deserve the respect of this Nation, and who should be welcome because there are a lot of good kids.

I will keep working on a solution, but now we have people who want to distract us, not only to distract us from trying to negotiate a reasonable outcome for DACA but adding the distraction and creating the toxic environment that shutting down the government will cause.

If we go back, what is amazing to me is that the very people who are now saying we should shut down the government made these kind of statements in the past. This is from former Speaker PELOSI in the House: ''Not too long ago it was an unthinkable tactic to use in a political debate.''

There is a long list of people.

Senator NELSON: ''You don't hold the country hostage.''

But that is exactly what they are proposing today.

Senator KING: ''. . . the constant hostage-taking situation to get something in that process that you couldn't get through the normal process.''

It is a hard quote to read, but the point is that now they want to take hostages. Now they want to do exactly what they thought, not long ago, was inappropriate, unkind, unfair, and uncompassionate.

Then we have Senator HEITKAMP: ''It is really bullying behavior when the small minority does this.''

I think it will be a minority that will oppose funding the government. So now people who didn't like the bullying behavior are trying to rationalize that somehow that it is OK.

The other issue we have here is that we have been getting close on a funding discussion, and we have been getting close on DACA. I don't know. I can't speak to you all directly, but if I were speaking to the pages, I would ask them whether or not they saw the ''Peanuts'' cartoon. There is a common theme that we talk about with Lucy and the football. The scene is where you are running down the field and you are about to kick the football, and just at about the time that you are going to do it, there is a group of people who want to pull the football away. That is what they are doing again.

Honestly, it gets tiring to see us come so close, to have so many reasonably minded people. Guess what. There are unreasonable people. It is a bipartisan situation we have here. I have friends. They are friends of mine, but on certain issues they become unreasonable. They are not part of the solution. All of a sudden they create these coalitions, and they are the Lucy taking away the football from those of us who actually want to score, want to make progress, want to fund the Government, and want to provide a solution for the DACA population. Now we have another Lucy and the football scenario on both the spending bill and also the DACA bill.

I also have to talk about the CHIP program. The CHIP program is something I wanted to reauthorize in September of last year. September of last year was the month before the program technically expired. However, there was sufficient money in reserves for the States to continue to run the programs. Those States are starting to run out of money, including States like mine, North Carolina. Now we have an opportunity to reauthorize for years, to provide certainty to this child population for years, and we are going to hold it hostage because we have an honest disagreement over things I think we can work out with the DACA Program.

We have seen what people have said in the past. In fact, one of these Senators actually had a countdown on how many days we failed to reauthorize DACA. It may very well be that when we take the vote tonight, that very same Senator will vote against a multiyear reauthorization for the CHIP program. That doesn't make sense. It is irrational. It doesn't solve anything. It creates a bigger problem when it comes to the funding discussion and when it ultimately comes to a reasonable outcome for the DACA population.

Finally, we can talk about the words of the Democratic leader. Again, it is amazing to me how things have changed.

So did you believe what you were saying then? Or is who we see now and what position you are taking now who you really are? People need to come to the floor and let me know. Is this what you meant or is your new position what you meant? You can't have it both ways. In politics, people try to, but you need to say something and stick with it. They need to defend which is their real position. If those are their positions in the past, let's pass the spending bill, let's work hard to get DACA done, and let's stop this theater that is not helping anybody. All this is doing is making people who work and rely on government funding worry, and it is making people who rely on government funding and the DACA population even more worried. Every day they think they are 1 day closer to having an illegal status here.

We see speeches on the floor about the Dreamers, the people who are doing well. Most of them are going to school, working, or serving in the military. I believe every single one of them. There are tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of more examples. That is why I am so motivated to come up with a solution. That is why I am so frustrated with those playing these games when we are so close.

So let's talk about DACA. There is the so-called gang that is putting together a bill. Let me back up and talk about a meeting that I attended in the White House last Tuesday. In the prior meeting I attended the previous Thursday, Republicans met with the President. We said: Mr. President, the way for us to get to a solution is to call Democrats and Republicans into a room, Members of the House and Senate, have us air our differences and then agree to a timeline for negotiating a deal that we can bring to the American people and solve this problem.

The President responded by calling a meeting on that Tuesday. Some people may have seen it. There was about 50 minutes of press coverage. Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who just came in here, was a part of that meeting. We all felt great about it. We aired our differences. We knew there were differences we needed to bridge. We agreed to four different pillars that we would use as a basis for negotiation. Come up with something that the DACA population needs, something compassionate—something very similar or maybe something between the bill that Senator LANKFORD, Senator HATCH, and I proposed, the SUCCEED Act and the Dream Act—and bridge the differences. We were making progress. We also knew that we had to deal with things like the diversity lottery, border security, and what some of our colleagues call family reunification, which has been abused and needs to be fixed. Others call it chain migration.

At the end of that meeting, we agreed that what we needed to do was to have the leaders, the whips of the House and the Senate—the Democrats and the Republicans—agree to a timeline and a schedule and then get together and work out our differences. I, for one, think those meetings should

be open to the public because then the public would realize, I think, that we are not that far apart. Unfortunately, we are a week and a half later, and the parties have not even reached an agreement on a schedule to begin the negotiations. Now we have another group of people that say: We have something that is pretty close and we may file a bill, or you need to get on to the bill.

Let me tell you the problem I have with that bill or the concept of the bill. No. 1, has it been introduced? No. So it is ''thoughtware.'' None of us can talk about the specific provisions because we don't have something we can score, look at, or understand the benefits and risks and issues associated with it and whether or not we can get the votes.

The question is, Does the bill have the support of the President? Well, I think you saw what was vetted on Thursday, which was not a specific provision, and that meeting last week didn't go too well on several different levels. We don't have an agreement.

The other question is, if you don't have an agreement with the President, you have to understand the process of the Congress. If the President were to veto the bill, and we are struggling to get 60 votes, now we would have to get 67 votes. Does anybody here honestly believe we will get 67 votes to withstand a veto override? So we have to get back to this one, to get the President behind it, because that is not going to happen. Even if that could happen, then we have to go to the House. It is not about a simple majority of the House Members. We have to think about a supermajority of House Members that would override a Presidential veto. Right now, based on the number of Members who are in the House—there are a couple of open seats—that is 288 votes. That isn't going to happen. That is not a very good scorecard. It is not a recipe for success.

I am one of the ones who want checked boxes next to a bill that the President supports, that the Senate will get 60 votes on, and the House will get more than half, so that we can solve the problem for the DACA population.

Things happen quickly here, and, hopefully, this is another example where they will. I hope my Republican colleagues recognize that voting against the funding bill is a bad idea. How do you work out of a shutdown? Almost certainly it will not end well. So I hope my Republican colleagues will vote for the spending bill, and I hope a majority or a good number of my Democratic colleagues will, so that we get the spending issue off the table. Then I hope that same group of people will come together and recognize that the gaps are not that hard to bridge for the DACA solution, that the border security measures are reasonable, that the changes in the elimination of the diversity lottery and a more reasonable way to allow merit-based immigration makes sense. We can deal with underrepresented countries to make absolutely certain that good hard-working people in those countries who want to come and live and work in America can do it. This is not a difficult thing to do.

It is almost as if people are going in the backroom trying to figure out how to make this more difficult than it needs to be.

I am telling and imploring the Members of the Senate, whether you are Republican or Democrat, vote for funding the Government. Vote for our soldiers. Vote for our veterans. Vote for the children who require these programs who are desperately in need of certainty. Then, quickly, get on DACA and vote for the Dreamers who need our support. Vote for border security so we can know who is coming across this border and we can make the Nation safer. These are commonsense, rational, and reasonable expectations, and if we lower the temperature here, if we treat people with respect, and if we actually not let the polar opposites impact what those of us in the center want to do, then we can avoid this crisis and we can do great things for millions of people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I speak—because Senator PERDUE wants to speak right after me—I ask unanimous consent that Senator PERDUE, assuming he shows up before I am done, be the next one in line to follow me.

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

DACA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to offer remarks about an issue of utmost important to this body and to the American people—the ongoing negotiations over the future of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA.

I should explain the justification for these young people. The children were brought here by their parents. Their parents crossed the border without papers, violating the law, but the children cannot be held guilty for the sins of their parents. That is why we feel it is very legitimate to do this humanitarian thing of legalizing DACA children—not in and of itself, but, as you heard from my colleague from North Carolina and you will hear from other people, the necessity of making sure that we have border security, that we do away with chain migration, and that we also do away with diversity visas—this is the scope of negotiations that ought to be going on to get a compromise for the humanitarian reason of giving certainty to these young DACA people.

Those things were narrowed at the White House a week ago Tuesday, not the famous Thursday meeting that you heard so much about last weekend but the meeting of 23 Republican and Democrat Members of both the House and Senate. When you get a bicameral, bipartisan group of people together with the President—and you want to do that because you want to make sure that when you reach an agreement, the President will sign it—it seems to me that is a significant way to move forward. But things tend to take different routes around here, and I am here because of some routes that I think are very puzzling at this point—pretty much along the lines of what the Senator from North Carolina just stated.

Last week, speaking to my colleagues, I told this body that we still weren't any closer to a legitimate and fair deal that promotes and protects the interests of the American people in a lawful immigration system, and, at the same time, what is very important is providing a fair and equitable solution on DACA. But we also want to take care of the interests of the American people, particularly the safety of the American people when it comes to criminal aliens.

Since I made that speech a week ago, we made some progress in a meeting that went on at the White House, which I just told you about. In spite of the many events of these past 2 weeks, the pronouncement I just made that we don't have a legitimate, fair deal on one hand to protect the American people and, on the other hand, to deliver the humanitarian ends that we need for the DACA kids—that pronouncement still holds true.

Unfortunately, immigration has become the ''Groundhog Day'' of the U.S. Senate. Democrats, and even some Republicans, keep repeating the same mistakes that we have been making for the past 30 years, and they don't seem to be learning from them. I should probably tell my colleagues what I have learned in those 30 years.

Thirty years ago, when I voted for an immigration bill—the last great big reform of immigration—we had 3 million undocumented people here. In good faith, we thought we had secured the border because throughout the history of the country, from the beginning, it had never been illegal to hire an illegal alien, and for the first time, we made it illegal for our employers to hire someone who is undocumented, taking away the magnet to come to this country. We thought it would secure the border if they couldn't be legally hired, and we legalized 3 million people. We didn't take into consideration the whole industry of false documents in which, if I go to an employer and show him a false document and they believe it is a true document, then they are not guilty of hiring me, even though I am technically an undocumented worker, because I am using a fraudulent document.

What happens when you reward illegality? You get more of it. So instead of the 3 million people we had legalized, we now have an 11-million person issue. That is what I have been told.

We don't want to repeat those mistakes, and that is why, besides legalizing DACA kids, border security and doing away with chain migration are so important. One of the bombers in New York was here because of chain migration—the terrorist who was just about ready to—well, he didn't kill anyone, but he injured a lot of people. Then we have another person who was here on a diversity visa and killed 8 people and injured 12 while driving down the streets of New York. So we have a major problem we have to take care of.

The President is very interested in taking care of this problem, as he enunciated in that Tuesday meeting, which was bicameral and bipartisan and narrowed the issues so that it would be easier for us to reach an agreement here. Instead of dealing with 100 things, 4 are taken care of—DACA, border security, doing away with diversity visas, and doing away with chain migration.

We don't want ''Groundhog Day'' to happen again in the U.S. Senate because it has been happening quite frequently. In the last 30 years, we thought we could solve this problem once and for all by taking away the magnet for people to come here for jobs, and we would secure the border. Well, 30 years later, you can understand why the President wants a wall and more border security.

In recent days, several of my colleagues formed what can best be described as a poor man's version of the Gang of 8. The Gang of 8 is affiliated with a very bad bill called comprehensive immigration. It passed in 2013 and went nowhere in the House of Representatives because it was unrealistic. These six Senators have decided that they—and they alone—will come up with a solution to the DACA crisis. Now they are demanding that their solution—and no other solution—receive a vote or they will shut the government down at midnight tomorrow night. That is right. These Senators, along with many Democrats, are threatening to shut the government down unless this plan gets a vote.

Surely, if these Senators are willing to prevent basic services from being provided to law-abiding, tax-paying American citizens and legal immigrants, their plan must be something that could garner wide bipartisan support, pass the House, and be signed into law by the President. It is far short of those four things that were agreed to at the bipartisan, bicameral meeting at the White House.

What is actually in this grand plan these Senators have come up with? Well, as of today, neither I nor my staff have actually seen text of the bill they are promoting. Why are they threatening a shutdown of the Federal Government over a bill that almost no one has been given a chance to read, and why are they threatening to shut down the government when there is still plenty of time? The deadline is March 5 to come to a meaningful solution that can earn bipartisan support.

Well, here is what we do know about their proposal, from one-page summaries. The bill would provide a massive amnesty to millions of people who are in this country unlawfully—before border security, making the same mistake we did in 1986. Their proposal doesn't just provide status to the young men and women enrolled in the DACA Program, which everyone in this Chamber agrees should be done; it dramatically expands the scope, granting legal status to potentially millions of others, including those who knowingly violate the law. It is unthinkable to me that we should reward that unlawful conduct, and it is ridiculous that Democrats and some Republicans are turning the tables and making this last-minute demand when there was such a successful meeting at the White House a week ago Tuesday. It was bipartisan, bicameral, with the President leading the discussion and everyone agreeing that we would narrow the 100 issues down to 4: DACA, border security, diversity visas, and ending chain migration.

Surely then, in exchange for this massive amnesty, their proposal would provide significant border security, enforcement, and chain migration reforms. If you were hoping for that answer to be yes, don't hold your breath. Their proposal has a paltry amount of funding for existing border security infrastructure improvement. That is right—no new infrastructure.

Their proposal also doesn't add new legal authorities to make it easier for law enforcement to apprehend, detain, and deport dangerous criminal aliens. Now, I think they are somewhat embarrassed that they don't have some proposals in there that dangerous criminal aliens ought to be deported easier than they are today.

So I have to ask, is there a reason why these Senators don't want to make it easier to remove these dangerous criminals? Do they want to protect sex offenders? Do they want to protect child molesters? Do they want drunk drivers, gang members, like MS–13, human traffickers, and drug smugglers roaming throughout this great United States of America?

I can't imagine the answer to any of these questions is yes. If I am right, then they need to tell the American people why they refused to give our government the new authorities needed to remove these individuals who have endangered our communities. They either support removing dangerous criminals or they don't. There is no going in between.

Their plan also fails to truly end chain migration. In fact, in that one-page document I have seen, these Senators acknowledge their chain migration fix would only affect 26,266 visas per year. That is right, just a little above 26,000. So in exchange for a potential amnesty for 8 million people, they have agreed to eliminate 26,000 visas a year. I am no mathematician, but that doesn't seem to be a very balanced agreement to me. They seem to be making the same mistakes I made in 1986.

Finally, their proposal doesn't even end the Diversity Visa Program. Remember, this is one of four agreements in a bicameral, bipartisan meeting with the President of the United States that everybody left the White House with an agreement that we were going to break within those four.

This Diversity Visa Program, we all know, is subject to fraud and abuse, and colleagues on both sides of the aisle have long called for its elimination—and I mean elimination, not reallocation. The proposal they are floating around doesn't do that.

To sum it up, this proposal is heavy on amnesty, learning nothing from the 1986 mistake I learned a lot from. Too bad there is only a handful of us around the U.S. Senate from that time because there would be a lot more missionaries saying that what happened in 1986 shouldn't be repeated.

Also, more importantly, it is nonexistent on security measures. This approach has been tried time and again, and that approach has failed. The American people simply don't want to provide a massive amnesty first and secure the border later. For those Members who think we can do amnesty first and security second, I think I made it quite clear: I think that is the wrong approach. I know because I have been here a long time, and I have been here at the time those mistakes have been made. We know they failed the goals we sought. I remember why it failed. Maybe—just maybe—if we actually provide safety first and then consider more comprehensive reforms later, we can break this repetitive cycle and end this immigration ''Groundhog Day.''

Maybe I ought to add to those four points that were agreed to at the White House. The President was promoting another step or two called comprehensive immigration reform, but get this done first. Secure the border first. If we actually provide security first, doing so would instill trust with the American people that we are dedicated to fixing this immigration issue, not simply delaying the same debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, as an outsider to this process, one of the first realizations was that, as I got here, things don't always move in a linear fashion from point A to point B. Many times, the people who are trying to move an issue from point A to point B aren't interested in getting to point B.

I would like to talk tonight about one of those issues. I think we have a situation here where both sides in this body—and I dare say in the House—pretty much want the same thing, but

I am afraid politics have gotten involved to where we are focusing more on the differences of what we might hope for than on what we agree upon. That is a shame because not only do we put a great confusion on these issues that I will talk about tonight, but we lose the confidence of the American people that we can even govern up here.

Last year, this President wanted to focus on getting the economy going. He wanted to focus on energy. He wanted to focus on regulations. He wanted to focus on taxes. Check the boxes. We did that. I believe we are seeing some of the early manifestations of that in the economy now, where 123 businesses just announced at the end of the year, year-end bonuses related to this tax bill that we passed last year. That is an example of where we can get together and make things happen.

I was in the Chair last night presiding over an hour and listening to conversations about a topic that I believe is very critical to where we are today. I heard several descriptions of a DACA bill but a bill no one has seen yet. It hasn't been presented. This is merely 1 day before we have to fund the government—before midnight tomorrow night.

In my opinion, I think most people in America believe it is irresponsible that Members of this body are threatening to shut down the Federal Government over this DACA issue.

Members of the other side of the aisle used to agree with that position. In 2013, the current minority leader said—and other people talked about this today: ''We could say, 'we're shutting down the government . . . until you pass immigration reform.' It would be governmental chaos.''

Well, that is what we are facing tonight. I just don't think there is any need for it because, honestly, if you want to solve the DACA situation, there is a deal to be done, but serious negotiations aren't being made right now because one side wants to create this issue and threaten to shut down the government, thinking they can get both, a financing deal that they favor, along with this DACA proposition. That is unfortunate.

Our men and women in uniform deserve better than that. You are an ex-officer. You know what I am saying. It is absolutely ridiculous that we are in the fourth month of this fiscal year in the middle of January—our fiscal year started October 1. It is absolutely ridiculous that we are sitting here today having not funded the government permanently for the balance of this year. No other entity that I know of anywhere—any business or any facet of operation—can do that except the U.S. Federal Government.

These two issues we are talking about have nothing to do with it and should not be tied together; that is, the DACA solution and funding the Federal Government. Given our global security crisis—and I do mean the word ''crisis'' today—I think the world is more dangerous than any time in my lifetime. I can't think of anything worse than to tie up the funding for our men and women in uniform with an issue like this; that we all want to solve anyway.

I am shocked the Democrats would advocate that we shut down the government over a bill no one has even seen yet and an issue that has nothing to do with getting the government funded. Creating a false deadline for a DACA solution, I believe—and using it to hold military certainty hostage—is no way to govern. I think most people back home agree with that. That is what is wrong with this institution today. Both sides need to stop it right now. We need to get to a vote and fund this government.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I would like to make a few comments about the current immigration system. That seems to be the topic of the day recently. I want to tell you some of us have been working on this for years. Some in this body have been working on it at least the last decade. Three times in the last 11 years, this body has tried to solve this problem unsuccessfully.

I believe one of the problems with each of those solutions or attempts at a solution was they tried to be comprehensive. People are misusing that word today when they talk about what we are trying to do on this side. These three attempts, over the last 11 years, attempted to solve not just the illegal situation and the temporary work visa situation, but they also tried to solve the legal situation. They tried to solve all of this.

Today, what we are trying to do on our side is to solve just the illegal immigration system before we even talk about DACA. The legal situation is this: 1.1 million green cards are given out every year today. That is up from 300,000 in 1965, when this bill—the law we operate under today—was first passed. What we believe is, if we get this done, then the next step would be to move to the temporary work visas, where we give out 2.2 million temporary work visas every year. Those need desperate work. Both sides agree to that. Some categories probably need to be increased; others need to be streamlined. There might need to be a new category created, but that needs speciality work.

Then, of course, we have to deal with the people who are here illegally. Remember, 40 percent of the people here illegally, or thereabouts, came into this country under a legal temporary work visa or a student visa, or some other form of temporary visa and overstayed their visa. We are one of the few countries in the developed world that can't track overstays, but that is not what we are trying to do. We are trying to bring focus to an issue that will stop this continuing evolution of immigration problems.

I believe there is a better way, and there is a proposition to do just that. There was a meeting in the White House last week on Tuesday, and the President started out the conversation—it was bipartisan, bicameral. You heard my colleague from Iowa Senator GRASSLEY talk about this. As part of that meeting, I was moved by how the President introduced this topic. He said, with regard to the DACA situation, we need to develop a compassionate approach that demonstrates love in dealing with these young people who are here illegally but through no fault of their own. The President, in that meeting, defined the scope, and he brought a sense of urgency to this topic. He expects a result.

He undid what we believe was an illegal act by the past President in giving work status to these individuals, and said—now this is President Trump—he said: This is the responsibility of Congress to put a law in place to deal with this. I agree with that, but let's be very clear about what is going on right now. We are not debating what to do with the DACA individuals, mostly aged 15 to 36.

My colleagues spoke last night as though they are the only ones committed to solving the DACA problem. That is not true. People on both sides of the aisle—in this body and in the House—believe we need to solve this problem. These individuals did not break the law, their parents did. We all agree there is a solution to be had. Again, the question is whether we are going to solve DACA without dealing with the things that created it in the first place.

The President was very clear last week—and he has been consistent on this issue, as have those of us who have been working on this over the last year, this new, focused approach on legal immigration. The President made it very clear that any solution on DACA has to include border security—including a wall—an end to chain migration, and an end to this perverse diversity visa lottery.

If we don't actually solve what created this, we are going to be right back here in just a few years. That is the problem I have with the bill that is being discussed here, this so-called Graham-Durbin exercise. I just don't know why we would do that and knowingly put ourselves in the same position in just a few years.

Haven't we learned our lesson from what we did in 1986, 1991? We know kicking the can down the road on this is not going to give us any solution, but we have an opportunity because we have commonality in this body about what we need to do going forward with not only the DACA situation but this legal immigration system. There is a great deal of commonality in thought. I have done deals in the business world, and when you get this level of commonality, a deal should get done. There is a lot of symmetry here to be had if we would just talk with each other and

get at the real issues and put political issues aside.

If we give DACA recipients a path for legal status without a real investment in border security and a wall, we are going to further incentivize a new wave of illegal immigration.

By the way, the President has said this publicly. It is not necessarily a 2,000-mile wall, but it is a system of constraints where we know that we can protect our southern borders. It is not just an immigration issue; it is a national security issue, as has been demonstrated by two acts of terror just in recent months. The plans I heard last night don't even address that seriously. A $1.8 billion allocation is not a serious attempt at that. The Dream Act—the estimated cost back in 2013 for doing that was $26 billion. Today, who knows what that estimate would be. It has to be greater than that.

The second criteria in this was that if we are going to solve the DACA problem and eliminate the things that created this issue going forward, we have to deal with how to protect the family of the immigrant, the primary worker. We must protect the immediate family of the person who is sponsored and comes in as a citizen. But I believe there is a great deal of confusion about that. This is the so-called chain migration. There is nothing derogatory about that term. That was a term used by the Gang of 8 in 2013. The Democratic leader and the whip of the Democrats right now all used that term repeatedly. There was nothing derogatory and there is certainly nothing prejudicial about that term; it was a mere description of what happens in the current law.

The current law says this: The person sponsored for citizenship comes in as a legal permanent resident, moves through a period of time, and becomes a citizen. If they apply, they become a citizen. After that process, as a citizen, they can then sponsor their spouse, their immediate minor children, their family, their adult married children, their adult unmarried children, their parents, and their siblings. The only thing we are talking about is limiting that to the primary worker and their immediate family, and that would break the so-called chain as described by our Members across the aisle.

Let's be very clear. Seventy-two percent of Americans believe that immigration should be limited to the individual worker, their spouse, and their immediate family. Again, the only difference between that ethos and what we have today are the parents and the siblings.

Somebody says: Well, I want to protect the family.

Well, so do we. But whose family? The family of the sponsored worker or their parents' family or their parents' parents' family or their parents' parents' siblings' family? Which family? I believe the American people have spoken loud and clear about which family.

There is a significant portion who believe it should just be the worker, but that is not our position. We believe we need to protect the family of that immediate worker.

There are some of us who are trying to get to a merit-based immigration system like Canada and Australia have been using for decades and they have proven works. It helps their society, builds their economy, and opens their doors with a welcoming hand for those who want to come. Canada is no bastion of conservatism in its immigration policy. Yet it has a merit-based immigration system.

Now, we are not proposing that. We are happy to wait for phase two, which the President talked about last week. Many people on the other side have absolutely discredited his words and confused them knowingly. What the President is talking about right now is, focus on this legal immigration system, solve DACA, solve the border crisis, eliminate the chain migration issue, and eliminate the diversity visa lottery. It is just that simple.

The diversity visa lottery is the last thing in his scope, and it is so easy. We all know that needs to be eliminated. The issue comes up in their bill that they want to reallocate the 50,000 people who are coming in today. We know that the diversity visa lottery is fraught with fraud. We know that it has been related to at least one act of terrorism, and it needs to be eliminated. How to do it is the question. Well, let's talk about that.

There is no reason why that can't be negotiated. But the Graham-Durbin bill, if it is ever offered, ensures that we will be right back here in a few short years. What we want is to have a solution on the DACA side and protect America from repeating this mistake again and again and again.

Let me be very clear. If we do what is on the table today in the Graham-Durbin bill, it would allow the parents of DACA recipients legal status. This would ignite future waves of parents entering the United States, putting their children at risk as they come across the border illegally. Thank God most of us have never had to deal with that. Imagine putting your children at risk coming across the border illegally. But then their children will eventually be given legal status, according to this bill and precedent, and then they will be able to sponsor their parents, who broke the law in the first place. Then here we go, reigniting another wave. So we have not done anything to prevent being right back here just a few short years from now.

I believe it is time for action. My colleagues last night talked about, well, nobody is offering up any other solution. Well, that is just not true. There are three Republican Senate bills right now that relate to this issue, active bills that have been filed, and they are out there. The language is out there. You can read them. There is one bill in the House. Chairman GOODLATTE was there in committee and brought out a bill. So it is just not true that we don't have things to talk about on the Republican side on this issue. What is missing in this process is a good-faith effort to negotiate the details of a deal and make it happen.

To try to make an end run on that process is not going to work. I don't believe it, and I don't think the American people want it. What they want is to solve DACA and ensure that we are not doing it again in just a few short years. This means that we need a real investment in border security. We need to put a focus on the immediate family of the sponsored new U.S. citizen, the family of the incoming immigrant, and we need to end this archaic, outdated diversity visa lottery.

The solutions are here. I might not be 100 percent happy, they might not be 100 percent happy, but I promise you that in my experience, this situation is closer to a deal, a negotiated deal right now because both sides really want to see an end to the situation where there is a question about the DACA recipients. But we want to make sure we are not back here in 5 years or even sooner dealing with the same problem again. That is the lesson we should have learned from 1986 and 1991.

It is an honor to be in this body, but it is time for action. It is time to get to point B. We know we have been trying for over a decade with many Members of this body who are well-intended. I, for one, am ready to negotiate. The President is ready to negotiate. Let's get together and make this happen. It is time for action. The American people demand it. But let's please don't tie this solution to the funding of the Federal Government. That is totally irresponsible. Our men and women in uniform deserve better.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. 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. THUNE. Mr. President, Democrats here in the Senate have really raised obstruction to an art form in this Congress. The Presidential nominees—they have obstructed and obstructed some more, even when they ultimately planned to support the nominee. We have had many nominees who have come to the floor who have been objected to and had to go through the long postcloture process, only to get to the end of it and have those nominees be voted out in many cases unanimously. I have seen that happen in the committee that I chair, the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. We have nominees over here who are noncontroversial who are being held up by the Democrats. Many of them are in important

positions in our government. The FRA—Federal Railroad Administrator—is a key safety position in the administration who is being held up by the Democrats even though he is supremely qualified for the job and I think will have a huge bipartisan vote here in the Senate, were it to occur.

We have seen this consistent pattern of obstruction when it comes to nominees and giving the President an opportunity to fill his administration with the positions that are key to not only his getting his agenda done but the American people seeing their government function in a way that represents their interests.

Tax reform. Well, Democrats absolutely refused to work with Republicans on a bill. They fought hard against passage despite the fact that the Democrats have previously called for reform and supported many of the very proposals that were included in the law.

Now, of course, the Democrats are threatening to shut down the government and block funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program—a program they claim to support—because they are not happy that they are not getting an immigration bill that they want this week. That is right, Mr. President—Democrats are threatening to shut down the government and block funding for health insurance for 9 million low-income children because they are not getting the bill they want when they want it.

Members on both sides of the aisle are eager to find a legislative solution to the status of children who were brought to this country illegally through no fault of their own. There is broad support among both Democrats and Republicans for getting a solution to that. In fact, there is a group who has been meeting every day on that very issue in an attempt to try to put together a solution that would help address that issue in a way that not only resolves the status of these young people who came to this country illegally but also addresses the broader issue of border security and chain migration and visa lotteries and all those sorts of things. So there are a series of issues that relate to immigration that are being worked on now by both sides of the aisle in the hope that they can come to a solution about that, but there is no agreement just yet.

While we hope to get to a deal as soon as possible, the deadline for reaching an agreement is not imminent, not to mention that passing a bill on the status of Dreamers is completely unrelated to the need to fund the government.

If the Democrats continue with their plan to block government funding, the government will shut down tomorrow night. That means that all kinds of government services will be affected in areas ranging from veterans, to public health, to worker and product safety, and to national parks and monuments. Funding for our military will also be threatened, which represents a particular danger as we try to rebuild our military after years of neglect under the Obama administration. Also, of course, as I mentioned, the Children's Health Insurance Program will not get funded, and 9 million low-income children will be well on the way to losing their healthcare coverage.

The Children's Health Insurance Program extension that we want to pass as part of this bill is something that has long been supported by Democrats. In fact, the policy in this bill is virtually identical to the bipartisan extension legislation that was introduced by Senators Hatch and Wyden and passed by the Senate Finance Committee last year, except that we have included an additional year of funding. I serve as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, and when we passed that bill last year, it was a 5-year authorization. The legislation that we will have in front of us this evening that will fund the government includes a 6-year reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program. That would mark the longest extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program since the program was created back in 1997. It would provide 6 years of guaranteed funding so that care for children and pregnant women can continue without disruption.

It is extremely difficult to understand how the same Democrats who have strongly advocated for this program are now opposing legislation to extend it and seeking to shut down the government. In fact, Democrats are now actively bragging that they have the votes to shut down the government.

Nobody thinks the short-term funding bill before us is ideal. We would much rather have a long-term agreement, and eventually we will. But this bill will fund the government, it will protect the military, and it will provide a very significant extension of an essential healthcare program for low-income children.

Democrats' intention of opposing this bill because they are upset that they can't get exactly what they want, when they want it, is irresponsible given the good-faith efforts that are being made by both sides to come to an agreement when it comes to the issue of immigration and when it comes to the issue of the broader funding debate we are having here in the Senate. This attempt by the Democrats is totally shortsighted. It is a partisan, political maneuver that will harm our troops and some of the most vulnerable among us.

We still have time before the government shuts down, and I hope the more moderate elements of the Democratic Party here in the Senate will rethink their leader's opposition to funding the government and to extending health insurance for low-income children and for pregnant women. That is what we are talking about. That is simply what this does. There is still time to come together to pass this bill and to move on to the other important priorities that are facing our Nation.

I hope that cooler heads will prevail, that people here in this Chamber will come to their senses, and that we can pass a funding bill this evening that would avoid a government shutdown tomorrow and would fund for 6 years the Children's Health Insurance Program and set up the conditions that would allow the discussions to continue about how to resolve some of the outstanding and unrelated issues that still need to come to a resolution.

That is my hope. I hope our colleagues on both sides will come to the realization that this idea that is being put forward by the Democrats—and for which, as I said, they are taking credit right now—of shutting down the government is really a bad idea and not in the best interests of the American people, nor those 9 million children who would benefit from a long-term extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, to paraphrase a Republican President I enjoyed knowing, here we go again.

In 1995 Republicans shut down our government. They wanted to recklessly cut education programs and environmental programs, and they even wanted to raise Medicare premiums on millions of senior citizens, and they were willing to shut down the government to do it.

Of course, more recently in 2013, Republicans once again sought to strip the healthcare of millions of Americans. They wanted to shut down the government in a failed effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Actually, that is an effort they continued this summer instead of negotiating a bipartisan budget deal that could have averted the situation we find ourselves in today.

In 2015 Republicans continued their attack on healthcare by bringing us to the brink of yet another government shutdown in an attempt to defund Planned Parenthood. Planned Parenthood is the source of healthcare to millions of Americans in rural America. Millions of American women, men, and young people—certainly, tens of thousands of Vermonters in my little State—trust and depend on Planned Parenthood for their basic healthcare needs, including annual health exams, cervical and breast cancer screening, and HIV screenings—terrible that they might provide that care to Americans.

They tried to shut down the government because of it. It was also in 2015 that the Republicans began their attack on Dreamers. They attempted to shut down the entire Department of Homeland Security, which protects our skies, our borders, and everything else, and they were risking our national security because they wanted to block DACA, the Dreamers bill.

If these were just talking points and political ploys, it would be one thing, but they have real consequences.

The 2013 Republican shutdown dealt a devastating blow to economic growth amounting to $1.5 billion per day. For a State the size of Vermont, $1.5 billion is a lot of money. It was an estimated $1.5 billion for each of the days of the shutdown, and there were 16 of those days. That is economic growth we lost that we never get back. Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers were furloughed through no fault of their own for a combined total of 6.6 million days. Lifesaving research on cancer, on diabetes, on heart conditions ground to a halt. The doors and fences of our iconic national parks and monuments that Americans have always relied on to go and see were shuttered.

Now, in 2018, President Trump wants to shut down the government over a cynical and misbegotten ''big, beautiful wall.'' And he wants that ''big, beautiful wall''—whatever it might be—to be paid for by U.S. taxpayers, not Mexico. He is using the Dreamers as negotiable commodities, as though they are some kind of money, instead of people, to meet his unreasonable demands to spend $18 billion on last century's technology. President Trump is making these demands after he promised taxpayers it wouldn't cost us a cent because Mexico would pay for it. Well, if he really believes that, open a bank account, and let Mexico send the money. When they send the money, we will build the wall. I mean, be serious. He said they will build it. Now he wants the American taxpayers—who are strapped on so many things—to build last century's technology. Let Mexico send us the money. When they do, we will build it. If he is telling the truth, they will send it. If he is not telling the truth, of course, they will not.

But he is also just continuing the Republican tradition of being the ''shutdown party.'' We have some very responsible Republicans and Democrats in the House and the Senate. I have not heard a single one of them say we need a good government shutdown. I take it back. One Republican has: Donald Trump. Donald Trump has said that our country needs ''a good shutdown.'' That is the only person, Republican or Democrat, I have heard say that they want a shutdown.

I wonder if that is what he has asked his own party to angle for—a manufactured crisis to distract from the fact that they are not doing their job. I can say, as the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I know the Democrats have been ready and willing to negotiate a spending agreement since last June. Instead of working toward that goal, congressional Republican leadership has spent the last year overturning consumer protections. They stripped healthcare from millions of Americans. They passed a massive tax cut for big corporations and wealthy Americans, paid for by middle-class Americans and future generations because it adds trillions to the deficit. But during that time, they continued to kick the can down the road.

They have failed to do their jobs to pass sensible spending bills to keep our government open. They have cast aside Congress's fundamental responsibilities in pursuit of a hyperpartisan agenda. As a result, we haven't reached a bipartisan budget deal that would allow us to strengthen our military—something both Republicans and Democrats want. We haven't reached a bipartisan budget deal to allow us to invest in our communities—something I believe both Republicans and Democrats want.

We all agree that the consequences of sequestration have been devastating. We have to lift the spending caps set into law by the Budget Control Act. Every Republican and Democrat I talked with has said they do, but we have to invest equally in our military and our communities because our national security is intrinsically linked to the investments we make in our communities. We are the greatest country in the world exactly because we make a commitment to invest in education and infrastructure. If we back off of that commitment, we are no longer great. We aim to provide the necessary resources to combat the opioid epidemic, and we strive to ensure that no child goes to school hungry, but if we don't have defense and nondefense parity in spending, we can't achieve these goals.

We have not passed a comprehensive disaster relief package that takes into consideration the unique needs of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. These are American citizens. They have been living without power and without access to clean drinking water, and communities, devastated by natural disasters for months, are without adequate help from their own country—the U.S. Government—and people are dying.

The Dreamers, who are American citizens in every way but on paper, have been thrown into crisis, a crisis of President Trump's own making, a crisis that threatens to tear them from the only lives they have ever known. Remember, the President is solely responsible—not Members here on this floor—for creating this untenable situation faced by the Dreamers. The President, all by himself—actually he is a party of one—rescinded the DACA policy.

Now we have a path forward, put together by Republicans and Democrats, which meets the requirements the President laid out himself. But instead he continues to favor governing by chaos. He continues to move the goal posts. He continues to push the agreement further out of reach. He continues to say that our country needs a good shutdown. So much for the ''Art of the Deal.'' I would never hire someone to make a deal like that.

The latest effort to kick the can down the road, which Republicans passed out of the House this evening, does not address any of these issues. Its attempt to address the needs of the Children's Health Insurance Program is public relations, but it is inadequate, and based on the President's own twitter feed—which I get dizzy trying to follow—goes in and out of favor with the President hourly. Why does the bill extend CHIP for 6 years when extending this bipartisan program for 10 years would actually save the taxpayers $6 billion? Why are community health centers—which millions of Americans and CHIP recipients depend upon for their primary care—not extended? Why don't we protect Americans and our taxpayers? Most importantly, why was this program allowed to expire and to be used as a negotiating part in the first place?

Republican leadership, led by the President, has brought us to the brink of a government shutdown. I have been here a long time. I have looked at a lot of good legislation and bad legislation. I do not want to say the most terrible thing possible about the House bill because I know the respect we show back and forth. But the House bill is a joke and does not have my support. It leaves too much in doubt. What it attempts to address is woefully inadequate.

The majority now wants bipartisan support. Why not do as we always used to and work with Democrats, instead of appealing for our support only after they have written a mishmash, laughable bill crafted behind closed doors?

I have been here over 40 years. I understand reality. Republicans control the House; Republicans control the Senate; Republicans control the Presidency. If Republicans want the government to stay open, it will stay open. If Republicans want the government to shut down, it will shut it down. I wish they would stop kicking the can down the road and start negotiating in good faith, as so many Senators in both parties have been willing to.

It is time to stop kicking the can down the road and time to start negotiating in good faith. Keep our government open, and show respect to those who live here in this country who consider themselves Americans.

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. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO BOB BUTLER

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to take a few moments to acknowledge my friend, Mayor Bob Butler of Marion, IL. Since April 16, 1963, the people of Marion have known Bob Butler as mayor. Think about this. During Bob Butler's span as mayor, there have been 11 U.S. Presidents and 10 Illinois Governors. Mayor Butler is the second longest serving active mayor in the country and is believed to be the longest serving mayor of Illinois. That is quite an accomplishment.

Prior to becoming mayor, Bob Butler served in the U.S. Army Counter Intelligence Corps after the wars in Japan and Korea. Service was in his blood, so it came as no surprise when Bob decided to run for mayor. Known for his straight-shooting, old-school style, Bob outlined his simple approach to governance during his first campaign: ''It's up to the mayor to study each problem as it arises, determine in his own mind what is best to do for all the people. I think the mayor of any town has got to stand on his own two feet and make up his mind without being dictated to by any individual or group. I think also when a man is elected mayor, the people are entitled to know where he stands. He ought to be able to tell the people. If a matter requires a 'yes' or 'no' answer, he should say 'yes' or 'no.' ''

Southern Illinois' newspaper of record, the Southern Illinoisan, endorsed Butler's candidacy, saying: ''Marion voters will choose Tuesday between orderly, progressive city government or a continuation of the present slap-dash regime . . . Butler, in short, offers an excellent alternative . . . He has our wholehearted support.'' Bob Butler won by 687 votes and never looked back. He won the next 13 mayoral elections in Marion.

During Mayor Butler's first council meeting, an entire block on the city square caught fire. The new council took office and shortly thereafter adjourned to help fight the fire. The fire shined a light on many of Marion's problems, inadequate firefighting resources and water supply, but that was just the tip of the iceberg. Mayor Butler inherited a city in financial crisis. Marion needed more people. Why? Because more people meant more money from the State. Mayor Butler got to work and, due to his leadership, turned Marion around.

Mayor Butler transformed Marion and southern Illinois through good old-fashioned hard work. Over the years, Mayor Butler's agenda helped turn Marion into a regional powerhouse along Interstate 57. During his tenure, Marion's population has grown nearly 92 percent. According to Mayor Butler, the secret to Marion's success was simply ''A strong business community and a strong city working together [that] produced great results.'' He is absolutely right.

Anyone who knows Mayor Butler knows that he is an avid reader. He is on record saying that his favorite political book is a three-part novel by Rafael Sabatini, ''Scaramouche.'' It opens with this line: ''He was born with a gift of laughter and a sense that the world was mad.''

With his 91st birthday approaching next week, I want to thank Mayor Butler for his extraordinary commitment to the people of Marion and his work to help his community and the world be just a little less mad. I wish him and his family all the best in their next chapter.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for January 2018. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2018, H. Con. Res. 71. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budget points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office CBO prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

The enforceable levels included in this report reflect all of the numerical adjustments made to the resolution since its passage. These adjustments include an update to enforceable levels for legislation enacted after the June 2017 CBO baseline was released but before enactment of the resolution, October 30, 2017; a revision to aggregates and allocations to accommodate legislation fulfilling the budget resolution's reconciliation instructions, December 19, 2017; and a revision to aggregates and the Appropriations Committee's allocation for emergency spending found in Fiscal Year 2018's third continuing resolution, H.R. 1370, December 21, 2017.

The information contained in this report captures legislative activity from the passage of the budget resolution through January 11, 2018.

Republican Budget Committee staff prepared tables 1 through 4 of this report.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the most recently adopted budget resolution. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. For this reporting period, 13 of the 16 authorizing committees are in compliance with their allocations. First, the Veterans' Affairs and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committees violated their allocations in December 2017, the former with a $2.1 billion extension of the Veterans Choice Program and the latter through a package of health extenders. Both of these extensions were included as separate divisions on the Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018, P.L. 115–96. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee violated its allocation earlier this month with the passage of the Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act, P.L. 115–103, which is estimated to increase spending by $5 million over the next 10 years. The Armed Services Committee, on the other hand, reduced spending over the budget window. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, P.L. 115–91, produced $16 million in outlay savings over the enforceable window.

Table 2 gives the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in section 312 and section 314 of the CBA. While no full-year appropriations bills have been enacted for Fiscal Year 2018, subcommittees are charged with permanent and advanced appropriations that first become available in that year.

The budget resolution contains two points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs in appropriations bills, CHIMPS. Tables 3 and 4 show compliance with Fiscal Year 2018 limits for overall CHIMPS and the Crime Victims Fund CHIMP, respectively. This information is used for determining points of order under section 4102 and section 4103 of H. Con. Res. 71, respectively. Notably, there have not been any full-year bills enacted thus far for Fiscal Year 2018 that include CHIMPS.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by the Congress.

CBO provided a spending and revenue report for Fiscal Year 2018, which helps enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under CBA section 311. In its report, CBO annualizes the temporary effects of the latest continuing resolution, which provides funding through January 19, 2018. For the enforcement of budgetary aggregates, the Budget Committee excludes this temporary funding. As such, the committee views current-law levels as being $836.3 billion and $468.6 billion below budget resolution levels for budget authority and outlays, respectively.

Current-law revenues continue to be in excess of the levels assumed by the budget resolution. On-budget revenue levels currently exceed assumed levels by $17.2 billion in Fiscal Year 2018, $84.3 billion over the Fiscal Year 2018–2022 period, and $135.4 billion over the Fiscal Year 2018–2027 period. These figures reflect current enforceable levels following the use of the reserve fund found in section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71 for H.R. 1, which is commonly referred to as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, P.L. 115–97.

Social Security outlay levels are consistent with the budget resolution's figures for all enforceable periods. Social Security revenues, however, are

$500 million below levels assumed for Fiscal Year 2018, $2.8 billion greater over the next 5 years and $26.9 billion greater than assumed over the next 10 years. These off-budget effects were generated by the reconciliation bill but not covered by the reserve fund adjustment filed, which pertained only to on-budget enforcement.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO rule. The Senate's PAYGO scorecard currently shows deficit reduction of $24 million in Fiscal Year 2018, $14 million over the Fiscal Year 2017–2022, and $15 million over Fiscal Year 2017–2027 periods. For Fiscal Year 2018, legislation has been enacted that would reduce outlays by $24 million. Over the Fiscal Year 2017–2022 period, legislation has been enacted that CBO estimates will decrease outlays by $13 million and increase revenues by $1 million. Over the Fiscal Year 2017–2027 period, legislation has been enacted that CBO estimates will decrease outlays by $11 million and increase revenues by $4 million. Notably absent from these amounts are the veterans and health extenders from the third continuing resolution discussed earlier. This is due to a provision in that measure that mandated the exclusion of those budgetary effects from both the Senate and statutory PAYGO scorecards. The Senate's PAYGO rule is enforced by section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71, the Fiscal Year 2018 budget resolution.

Finally, included in this submission is a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor since the adoption of the budget resolution. During this reporting period, there were seven budgetary points of order raised in the Senate. Six of these points of order were raised during consideration of fiscal year 2018 reconciliation legislation. Votes to waive the CBA with respect to each of the points of order, ranging from Byrd Rule violations to committee allocation breaches, failed. Senator RAND PAUL raised the final budgetary point of order, for a violation of the Budget Committee's jurisdiction, against H.R. 1370, the third continuing resolution. The Senate waived the CBA with respect to this point of order by a vote of 91–8.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (−) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

(In millions of dollars)

	2018	2018–2022	2018–2027
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (−) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	2018	2018–2022	2018–2027
Armed Services:			
Budget Authority	−33	−102	−76
Outlays	−24	−15	−16
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Energy and Natural Resources:			
Budget Authority	0	2	5
Outlays	0	2	5
Environment and Public Works:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Finance:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Foreign Relations:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Judiciary:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:			
Budget Authority	705	−46	−46
Outlays	205	318	−39
Rules and Administration:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Intelligence:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:			
Budget Authority	2,100	2,100	2,100
Outlays	1,050	2,100	2,100
Indian Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Small Business:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Total:			
Budget Authority	2,772	1,954	1,983
Outlays	1,231	2,405	2,050

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS [1]

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

	2018	
	Security [2]	Nonsecurity [2]
Statutory Discretionary Limits	549,057	515,749
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	9
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	46	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	0	9
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	24,698
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	63,878
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	4,400
Current Level Total	46	92,994
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (−) Statutory Limits	−549,011	−422,755

[1] This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

[2] Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

	2018
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2017	17,000

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)—Continued

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

	2018
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	−17,000

TABLE 4.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

	2018
Crime Victims Fund (CVF) CHIMP Limit for Fiscal Year 2018	11,224
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CVF CHIMP Above (+) or Below (−) Budget Resolution	−11,224

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 18, 2018.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2018 budget and is current through January 11, 2018. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 71, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

This is CBO's first current level report for fiscal year 2018.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF JANUARY 11, 2018

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (−) Resolution
On-Budget:			
Budget Authority	3,085.1	3,333.9	248.7
Outlays	3,101.4	3,260.3	158.9
Revenues	2,497.1	2,514.3	17.2
Off-Budget:			
Social Security Outlays [a]	849.6	849.6	0.0

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF JANUARY 11, 2018—Continued

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (−) Resolution
Social Security Revenues	873.3	872.8	−0.5

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

[a] Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF JANUARY 11, 2018

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: [a]			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,658,139
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,106,043	2,004,065	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	.....	513,307	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−866,685	−866,685	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,239,358	1,650,687	2,658,139
Enacted Legislation:			
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (P.L. 115–91)	−33	−24	0
Department of Defense Missile Defeat and Defense Enhancements Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–96, Division B)	4,686	803	0
CHIP and Public Health Funding Extension Act (P.L. 115–96, Division C)	705	205	0
Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act of 2017 (P. L. 115–96, Division D)	2,100	1,050	0
An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (P. L. 115–97)	−8,600	−8,600	−143,800
Total, Enacted Legislation	−1,142	−6,566	−143,800
Continuing Resolution:			
Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–96, Division A) [b]	1,085,037	627,519	0
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	1,010,879	988,931	0
Total Current Level: [a, c]	3,333,869	3,260,308	2,514,339
Total Senate Resolution: [d]	3,085,147	3,101,424	2,497,139
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	248,722	158,884	17,200
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n a.	n.a.	n a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2018–2027			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	31,131,371
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	30,995,967
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	135,404
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

[a] Emergency funding that was not designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 does not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. These amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63)	263	263	0

[b] Sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255), provided funding for innovation projects and state responses to opioid abuse. CBO estimated that for fiscal year 2018, these sections provided a combined $866 million in budget authority, which would result in $706 million in outlays. However, consistent with sections 1001–1004 of P.L. 114–255, for the purposes of estimating the budgetary effects of those provisions under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Budget Control Act) and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act), those amounts are estimated to provide no budget authority or outlays.

[c] For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authonty, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

[d] Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in H. Con. Res. 71, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Senate Resolution as Passed	3,136,721	3,131,688	2,490,936
Adjustments made pursuant to section 4205 of H. Con Res. 71	36,780	21,753	3
Assumed discretionary spending not constrained by the budgetary cap established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–25)	−84,440	−44,220	0
Assumed witholding of budgetary effects of reconciliation legislation held in reserve pursuant to section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71	0	0	150,000
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71	−8,600	−8,600	−143,800
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	4,686	803	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,085,147	3,101,424	2,497,139

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS, AS OF JANUARY 11, 2018

(In millions of dollars)

	2018	2017–2022	2017–2027
Beginning Balance [a]	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation: [b,c,d]			
Protecting Patient Access to Emergency Medications Act of 2017 (H.R. 304, P.L. 115–83)	*	*	*
TSP Modernization Act of 2017 (H.R. 3031, P.L. 115–84)	*	*	*
FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017 (H.R. 3243, P.L. 115–88)	*	*	*
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (H.R. 2810, P.L. 115–91)	−24	−16	−21
Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017, Improvements Act (S. 371, P.L. 115–94)	*	*	*
An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes. (H.R. 1370, P.L. 115–96) [e]	*	*	1
An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (H.R. 1, P.L. 115–97) [f]	*	n.a.	n.a.
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 (H.R. 560, P.L. 115–101)	*	*	*
400 Years of African-American History Commission Act (H.R. 1242, P.L. 115–102)	*	*	*
Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act (H.R. 1306, P.L. 115–103)	*	2	5
To authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps. (H.R. 4641)	*	*	*
Current Balance	−24	−14	−15
	2018	2017–2022	2017–2027
Changes to Revenues	0	1	4
Changes to Outlays	−24	−13	−11

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: P.L. = Public Law; * = between −$500,000 and $500,000.

[a] On October 26, 2017, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget reset the Senate's Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.
[b] The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.
[c] Excludes off-budget amounts.
[d] Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.
[e] Pursuant to Division E of P.L. 115-96, the budgetary effects of divisions C and D are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO Scorecard.
[f] Section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, granted the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee the authority to revise balances on the Senate PAYGO ledger to fully incorporate the budgetary effects of P.L. 115-97. The Chairman exercised this authority with a filing in the Congressional Record on December 19, 2017.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 115TH CONGRESS

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waiver [1]	Result
294	December 1, 2017.	S. Amdt. 1720 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—created a point of order against legislation that cuts Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid benefits.	313(b)(1)(A)-Byrd violation [2]	Sen Sanders (I–VT)	46–54, Not Waived.
295	December 1, 2017.	S. Amdt. 1854 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the Child Tax Credit.	302(f)-Exceeds a committee's 302(a) allocation [3]	Sen. Brown (D–OH)	48–52, Not Waived.
296	December 1, 2017.	S. Amdt. 1850 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—increased the refundability of the Child Tax Credit.	302(f)-Exceeds a committee's 302(a) allocation [4]	Sen. Rubio (R–FL)	29–71, Not Waived.
299	December 2, 2107.	S. Amdt. 1846 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—provided for middle class tax relief	4105-Unknown Budgetary Effects [5]	Sen. Kaine (D–VA)	34–65, Not Waived.
301	December 2, 2017.	S. Amdt. 1717 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—struck title II	30(f)-Exceeds a committee's 302(a) allocation [6]	Sen. Cantwell (D–WA).	48–52, Not Waived.
322	December 20, 2017.	H.R. 1—provided for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.	313(b)(1)—Byrd Rule violations [7]	Sen. Enzi (R–WY)	51–48, NOt Waived.
324	December 21, 2017.	H.R. 1370—continuing resolution	306-Budget Committee jurisdiction [8]	Sen. Collins (R–ME).	91–8, Waived.

[1] All motions to waive were offered pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.
[2] Senator Enzi raised a 313(b)(1)(A) point of order against the Sanders amendment because the amendment did not produce a change in outlays or a change in revenues and was extraneous to the reconciliation instruction.
[3] Senator Enzi raised a 302(f) point of order as S. Amdt. 1854 would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the Finance Committee's section 302(a) allocation of new budget authonty or outlays,
[4] Senator Wyden raised a 302(f) point of order as S. Amdt. 1850 would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the Finance Committee's section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays.
[5] Senator Toomey raised this point of order because the budgetary effects of the Kaine amendment were unknown at the time of consideration.
[6] Senator Murkowski raised a 302(f) point of order because the Cantwell amendment, if adopted, would have caused the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to exceed its section 302(a) allocation of budget authority or outlays.
[7] Senator Sanders raised a 313(b)(1)(A) point of order against section 11000(a), and 313(b)(1)(D) points of order against page 75, line 17 through page 76, line 9 and against the phrase "tuition-paying" as it appeared on page 309, line 12, and page 309, lines 14 through 15.
[8] Senator Paul raised a section 306 point of order in relation to the statutory pay-go scorecard.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17–80, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Belgium for defense articles and services estimated to cost $6.53 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17–80

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Belgium

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* $4.53 billion
Other $2.00 billion
Total $6.53 billion

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Thirty-four (34) F–35 Joint Strike Fighter Conventional Take Off and Landing (CTOL) Aircraft.

Thirty-eight (38) Pratt & Whitney F–135 Engines (34 installed, 4 spares).

Non-MDE: Also included are Electronic Warfare Systems; Command, Control, Communications, Computer and Intelligence/Communications, Navigational, and Identification (C4I/CNI); Autonomic Logistics Global Support System (ALGS); Autonomic Logistics Information System (ALIS); Full Mission Trainer; Weapons Employment Capability, and other Subsystems, Features, and Capabilities; F–35 unique infrared flares; Reprogramming center; F–35 Performance Based Logistics; software development/integration; aircraft ferry and tanker support; support equipment; tools and test equipment; communications equipment; spares and repair parts; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documents; U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics personnel services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (BE–D–SAD).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: January 18, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Belgium—F–35 Joint Strike Fighter Aircraft

The Government of Belgium has requested to buy thirty-four (34) F–35 Joint Strike Fighter Conventional Take Off and Landing (CTOL) aircraft, and thirty-eight (38) Pratt & Whitney F–135 engines (34 installed, 4 spares). Also included are Electronic Warfare Systems; Command, Control, Communications, Computer and Intelligence/Communications, Navigational, and Identification (C4VCNI); Autonomic Logistics Global Support System (ALGS); Autonomic Logistics Information System (ALIS); Full Mission Trainer, Weapons Employment Capability, and other Subsystems, Features, and Capabilities; F–35 unique infrared flares; Reprogramming center; F–35 Performance Based Logistics; software development/integration; aircraft ferry and tanker support; support equipment; tools and test equipment; communications equipment; spares and repair parts; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documents; U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics personnel services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total case value is $6.53 billion.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of an ally and partner nation which has been, and continues to be, an important force for political and economic stability in Western Europe.

This proposed sale of F–35s will provide Belgium with a credible defense capability to deter aggression in the region and ensure interoperability with U.S. forces. The proposed sale will augment Belgium's operational aircraft inventory and enhance its air-to-air and air-to-ground self-defense capability. Belgium will have no difficulty absorbing these aircraft into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractors will be Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company, Fort Worth, TX; and Pratt & Whitney Military Engines, East Hartford, CT. This proposal is being offered in the context of a competition. If the proposal is accepted, it is expected that offset agreements will be required. All offsets are defined in negotiations between the Purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require multiple trips to Belgium involving U.S. Government and contractor representatives for technical reviews/support, program management, and training over the life of the program. U.S. contractor representatives will be required in Belgium to conduct Contractor Engineering Technical Services (CETS) and Autonomic Logistics and Global Support (ALGS) for after-aircraft delivery.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17–80

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The F–35 Conventional Take-Off and Landing (CTOL) Block 3 aircraft is classified SECRET, except as noted below. It contains current technology representing the F–35 low observable airframe/outer mold line, Pratt & Whitney engine, radar, integrated core processor central computer, mission systems/electronic warfare suite, a multiple sensor suite, operational flight and maintenance trainers, technical data/documentation, and associated software. As the aircraft and its subsystems are under development, many specific identifying equipment/system nomenclatures have not been assigned to date. Sensitive and classified elements of the F–35 CTOL Block 3 aircraft include hardware, accessories, components, and associated software for the following major subsystems:

a. The Propulsion system is classified SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. The single 40,000–lb thrust class engine is designed for low observability and has been integrated into the aircraft system. Pratt & Whitney, with the F–135, is developing and producing engine turbo machinery compatible with the F–35 and assures highly reliable, affordable performance. The engine is designed to be utilized in all F–35 variants, providing unmatched commonality and supportability throughout the worldwide base of F–35 users. The CTOL propulsion configuration consists of a main engine, diverterless supersonic inlet, and a Low Observable Axisymmetric Nozzle (LOAN).

b. The AN/APG–81 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) provides mission systems with air-to-air and air-to-ground tracks which the mission system uses as a component to sensor fusion. The AESA allows the radar to direct RF energy in a way that does not expose the F–35, allowing it to maintain low observability in high-threat environments. The radar subsystem supports integrated system performance for air-to-air missions by providing search, track, identification, and AIM–120 missile data link functionality. The radar also provides synthetic aperture radar mapping for locating surface targets and weather mapping for weather avoidance. The radar functions are tightly integrated, interleaved, and managed by an interface to sensor management functions within mission software. The hardware and software are classified SECRET.

c. The Electro Optical Targeting System (EOTS) contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. The EOTS subsystem to the sensor suite provides long-range detection and tracking, Infrared Search and Track (IRST) capability, a Forward-Looking Infrared (FLIR) sensor for precision tracking, and Bomb Damage Indication (BDI) capability. EOTS replaces multiple separate internal or podded systems typically found on legacy aircraft. The functionality of the EOTS employs the following modes: Targeting FLIR; Laser Range-Finding and Target Designation; EO DAS and EOTS Performance.

d. The Electro-Optical Distributed Aperture System (EODAS) is a subsystem to the sensor suite and provides full spherical coverage for air-to-air and air-to-ground detection and Navigation Forward Looking Infrared (NFLIR) imaging. The system contains both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. The NFLIR capability provides infrared (IR) imagery directly to the pilot's Helmet-Mounted Display (HMD) for navigation in total darkness, including takeoff and landing, and provides a passive IR input to the F–35's sensor fusion algorithms. The all-aspect missile warning function provides time-critical warnings of incoming missiles and cues other subsystems to provide effective countermeasure employment. EODAS also provides an IRST function that can create and maintain Situational Awareness-quality tracks (SAIRST). EODAS is a mid-wave Infrared (IR) system consisting of six identical sensors distributed around the F–35 aircraft. Each sensor has a corresponding airframe window panel integrated with the aircraft structure to meet aerodynamic and stealth requirements.

e. The Electronic Warfare (EW) system contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. Sensitive elements include: apertures; radio frequency (RF) and infrared (IR) countermeasures; and Electronic Countermeasures (ECM) techniques and features. The reprogrammable, integrated system provides radar warning and electronic support measures (ESM) along with a fully integrated countermeasures (CM) system. The EW system is the primary subsystem used to enhance situational awareness, targeting support and self defense through the search, intercept, location and identification of in-band emitters and to automatically counter IR and RF threats. The IR and RF countermeasures are classified SECRET. This system uses low signature-embedded apertures, located in the aircraft control surface edges, to provide direction finding and identification of surface and airborne emitters and the geo-location of surface emitters. The system is classified SECRET.

f. The Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence/Communications, Navigation, and Identification (C4I/CNI) system provides the pilot with unmatched connectivity to flight members, coalition forces, and the battlefield. It is an integrated subsystem designed to provide a broad spectrum of secure, anti-jam, covert voice and data communications, precision radio navigation and landing capability, self-identification, beyond visual range target identification, and connectivity with off-board sources of information. The functionality is tightly integrated within the mission system for enhanced efficiency and effectiveness in the areas of communications, navigation, identification, and sensor fusion. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. The CNI function includes both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements. Sensitive elements of the CNI subsystems include:

(1) The VHF/UHF Voice and Data (Plain and Secure) Communication functionality includes air-to-air UHF/VHF voice and data, both clear and secure, to provide communications with other friendly and coalition aircraft, air-to-ground UHF voice to provide communications with ground sites, and intercommunication voice and tone alerts to provide communications between the avionics system and the pilot. UHF/VHF downlink of air vehicle status and maintenance information is provided to notify the ground crews of the amounts and types of stores, fuel, and other supplies or equipment needed to quickly turn the aircraft for the next mission. The system contains both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(2) The Tactical Air Navigation (TACAN) functionality provides operational modes to identify ground station and to provide bearing-to-station, slant range-to-ground station, bearing-to-airborne station and slant range to the nearest airborne station or aircraft. TACAN is not unique to the F–35 aircraft but is standard on most U.S. Air Force aircraft. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(3) The Identification Friend or Foe Interrogator and Transponder Identification functionality consists of integrated Mark XII Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) transponder capability to provide identification of other friendly forces. The CNI system supports sensor fusion by supplying data from IFF interrogations and off-board sources through the intra-flight data link. The system contains both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(4) The Global Positioning System Navigation functionality includes the Global Positioning System (GPS) aided inertial navigation to provide high-quality positional navigation, and the Instrument Landing System (ILS)/Tactical Air Control and Navigation (TACAN) to provide navigation and landing cues within controlled airspace. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(5) The Multi-Function Advanced Data Link (MADL) is used specifically for communications between F–35 aircraft and has a very low probability of intercept, contributing to covert operations. The system contains both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(6) The Inertial Navigation System is an all-attitude, Ring Laser Gyro-based navigation system providing outputs of linear and angular acceleration, velocity, body angular rates, position, altitude (roll, pitch, and platform azimuth), magnetic and true heading, altitude, and time tags. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(7) The Radar Altimeter functionality is a module provided in the CNI system rack 3A and uses separate transmit and receive antennae. It measures and reports altitude, and altitude rate of change. Control data is transferred over to a configurable avionics interface card which translates the information to the F–35 aircraft computers. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(8) The Instrument Landing System (ILS) measures, and reports azimuth course and alignment, elevation course alignment, and distance to the runway. Data from the ILS is used to drive visual flight instrumentation. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(9) The Tactical Data Link is a secure broadcast Tactical Digital Information Link (TADIL) used for real-time voice/data exchange for command and control, relative navigation, and Precise Position Location Identification (PPLI), providing Link–16 type capabilities. The system contains both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

g. The F–35 Autonomic Logistics Global Sustainment (ALGS) includes both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements. It provides a fully integrated logistics management solution. ALGS integrates a number of functional areas, including supply chain management, repair, support equipment, engine support, and training. The ALGS infrastructure employs a state-of-the-art information system that provides real-time, decision-worthy information for sustainment decisions by flight line personnel. Prognostic health monitoring technology is integrated with the air system and is crucial to the predictive maintenance of vital components.

h. The F–35 Autonomic Logistics Information System (ALIS) includes both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements. The ALIS provides an intelligent information infrastructure that binds all of the key concepts of ALGS into an effective support system. ALIS establishes the appropriate interfaces among the F–35 Air Vehicle, the warfighter, the training system, government information technology (IT) systems, JSF operations, and supporting commercial enterprise systems. Additionally, ALIS provides a comprehensive tool for data collection and analysis, decision support, and action tracking.

i. The F–35 Training System includes both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements. The Training System includes several types of training devices, to provide for integrated training of both pilots and maintainers. The pilot training device includes a Full Mission Simulator (FMS). The maintainer training devices include an Aircraft Systems Maintenance Trainer (ASMT), Ejection System Maintenance Trainer (ESMT), and Weapons Loading Trainer (WLT). The F–35 Training System can be integrated, where both pilots and maintainers learn in the same Integrated Training Center (ITC). Alternatively, the pilots and maintainers can train in separate facilities (Pilot Training Center and Maintenance Training Center).

j. Weapons employment capability is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. Sensitive elements include co-operative targeting.

k. Other Subsystems, Features, and Capabilities:

(1) The Low Observable Air Frame is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is SECRET. Sensitive elements include: the Radar Cross Section and its corresponding plots, construction materials and fabrication.

(2) The Integrated Core Processor (ICP) Central Computer is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. Sensitive elements include: F–35 Integrated Core Processor utilizing Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS) Hardware and Module Design to maximize growth and allow for efficient management of DMS and Technology Insertion, if additional processing is needed, a second ICP will be installed in the space reserved for that purpose, more than doubling the current throughput and memory capacity.

(3) The F–35 Helmet Mounted Display System (HMDS) is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is SECRET. Software (object code) is SECRET. Sensitive elements include: HMDS consists of the Display Management Computer-Helmet, a helmet shell/display module, a quick disconnect integrated as part of the ejection seat, helmet trackers and tracker processing, day- and night-vision camera functions, and dedicated system/graphics processing. The HMDS provides a fully sunlight readable, bi-ocular display presentation of aircraft information projected onto the pilot's helmet visor. The use of a night vision camera integrated into the helmet eliminates the need for separate Night Vision Goggles (NVG). The camera video is integrated with EO and IR imaging inputs and displayed on the pilot's visor to provide a comprehensive night operational capability.

(4) The Pilot Life Support System is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is SECRET. Software (object code) is SECRET. Sensitive elements include: a measure of Pilot Chemical, Biological, and Radiological Protection through use of an On-Board Oxygen Generating System (OBOGS); and an escape system that provide additional protection to the pilot. OBOGS takes the Power and Thermal Management System (PTMS) air and enriches it by removing gases (mainly nitrogen) by adsorption, thereby increasing the concentration of oxygen in the product gas and supplying breathable air to the pilot.

(5) The Off-Board Mission Support System is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is SECRET. Software (object code) is SECRET. Sensitive elements include: mission planning, mission briefing, maintenance/intelligence/tactical debriefing, sensor/algorithm planning, EW system reprogramming, data debrief, etc.

1. Publications: Manuals are considered SECRET as they contain information on aircraft/system performance and inherent vulnerabilities.

2. The JSF Reprogramming Center is classified SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. This hardware/software facility is located in the U.S. and provides F–35 customers a means to update JSF electronic warfare databases. Sensitive elements include: EW software databases and tools to modify these databases.

3. (U) If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of specific hardware, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. (U) A determination has been made that Belgium can provide substantially the same degree of protection for sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sustainment program is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

5. (U) All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Belgium.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, on December 21, 2017, Senator ISAKSON was necessarily absent for the vote on the continuing resolution. He intended to vote yea, and it was my intention to vote no. As a courtesy to Senator ISAKSON, I voted yea, in order to pair our votes.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL FRANK G. KLOTZ

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, along with Senator FEINSTEIN, I would like to pay tribute to Lt. Gen. Frank G. Klotz, USAF, Retired, upon his retirement as the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Today we pay tribute to Lt. Gen. Frank G. Klotz, USAF, Retired for a distinguished career of nearly 45 years. His career began with his graduation in 1973 from the Air Force Academy and concludes when he steps down Friday after 4 years as Under Secretary for Nuclear Security and Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration, NNSA.

Lieutenant General Klotz has excelled in many challenging positions. As commander of Air Force Global Strike Command, he established and led a new organization that merged responsibility for all U.S. nuclear-capable bombers and land-based missiles under a single chain of command. He also served as vice commander of the Air Force Space Command, director for Nuclear Weapons Policy and Arms Control on the National Security Council, and as a defense Attache to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. A Rhodes Scholar, General Klotz earned a master of philosophy in international relations and a doctor of philosophy in politics at Oxford University.

As Administrator of NNSA over the past 4 years, Lieutenent General Klotz has been responsible for maintaining the U.S. nuclear deterrent, preventing nuclear proliferation worldwide, and advancing the naval nuclear propulsion mission. These missions require extraordinary dedication, and our Nation is safer today because of his steadfast leadership.

Under his guidance, NNSA made significant advances in modernizing the nuclear stockpile and reversed a decades-long trend in the decline of America's nuclear weapons infrastructure. His commitment to reducing global nuclear threats ensured continued progress in removing dangerous nuclear materials from countries around the globe, and his personal engagement expanded partnerships with other countries to reduce the risks of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism.

Perhaps most importantly, Lieutenent General Klotz cared about his people. He worked tirelessly to improve the work environments of his people, increase the focus on safety and security, and foster a culture of pride,

employee engagement, and excellence across the nuclear security enterprise.

We enjoyed the many interactions we had with General Klotz. He was always happy to sit down and discuss any concerns we had and work with us to resolve those issues. He also worked closely with us to get large construction projects, like the Uranium Process Facility, on schedule and on budget.

His selfless commitment to serving our Nation has left us safer and better prepared to respond to threats around the world. He leaves a legacy of service, commitment to people, and dedication to our Nation. With our deepest gratitude, we wish him the very best in retirement after an impressive and impactful career.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CURTIS AND MARLYS SCHWADERER

• Mr. DAINES. Madam President, today I have the distinct honor of recognizing Curtis and Marlys Schwaderer for their many years of service to the community of Superior, MT, as owners of Mineral Pharmacy. For decades, Mineral Pharmacy has been a cornerstone business in the community, providing vital services for its people.

A graduate of the pharmacy school at the University of Montana, Curtis purchased the pharmacy 27 years ago. Together, he and his wife, Marlys, ran the business and raised two sons in the community. As Superior has struggled with the decline of the timber industry with rising unemployment and falling incomes, the Schwaderers and their business have been a constant and stabilizing presence, a beacon of certainty in uncertain times.

In November, after 43 years as pharmacist and 27 years at Mineral Pharmacy, Curtis retired, and he and Marlys announced they were selling the business. Under new ownership, the pharmacy continues to serve the community of Superior, and the Schwaderers themselves remain members of the community. The Schwaderers and Mineral Pharmacy are an excellent example of what committed community members and a business can mean to a small town. Every day, in small towns across Montana, you will find hard-working people like the Schwaderers and small businesses like Mineral Pharmacy working hard to keep our communities strong. They are truly the lifeblood of our State.

Thank you, Curtis and Marlys, for your many years of hard work and service to your community. I wish you all the best in your next chapter.•

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.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:03 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. 3326. An act to increase accountability, combat corruption, and strengthen management effectiveness at the World Bank.

H.R. 3445. An act to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3776. An act to support United States international cyber diplomacy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4258. An act to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 with public and private resources, to enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4279. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise any rules necessary to enable closed-end companies to use the securities offering and proxy rules that are available to other issuers of securities.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:37 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 117. An act to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as ''Alex Diekmann Peak''.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 4:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 139. An act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to improve foreign intelligence collection and the safeguards, accountability, and oversight of acquisitions of foreign intelligence, to extend title VII of such Act, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 7:57 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 195) to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 3326. An act to increase accountability, combat corruption, and strengthen management effectiveness at the World Bank; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 3776. An act to support United States international cyber diplomacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 4258. An act to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 with public and private resources, to enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4279. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise any rules necessary to enable closed-end companies to use the securities offering and proxy rules that are available to other issuers of securities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 2070, A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, and to promote initiatives that will reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism (Rept. No. 115–200).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2017.

*James Bridenstine, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2018.

*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

*Brendan Carr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2018.

*Diana Furchtgott-Roth, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

*Barry Lee Myers, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

*Leon A. Westmoreland, of Georgia, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Carlos Trujillo, of Florida, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Carlos Trujillo.

Post: Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $1,000, 12/22/2015, Carlos Lopez-Cantera for Senate.

2. Spouse: Carmen Maria Mir, None.

3. Children and Spouses: Carlos Manuel Trujillo, none; Isabella Alba Trujillo, none; Juan Pablo Trujillo, none; Felipe Andres Trujillo, none.

4. Parents: Georgina Hernandez, none; Ruben Trujillo, none.

5. Grandparents: Manuel Jose Fernandez, none; Alba Rosa Fernandez—deceased, none; Domingo Ruben Trujillo, none; Mirta Trujillo, none.

6. Brothers and Spouses: David Trujillo, none; Gianina Trujillo, none; Catalina Trujillo, none; Ruben Trujillo, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Jennifer Hernandez, none.

*Joel Danies, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe.

Nominee: Joel Danies.

Post: Gabon, Sao Tome and Principe.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: $200, 10/19/2012, Obama for America.

2. Spouse: Caren Danies: $200, 10/30/2016, Hillary Victory Fund.

3. Children and Spouses: Judson A. Danies 0; Blair H. A. Danies 0.

4. Parents: Edgard Danies—Deceased; Marie-Therese Daines—Deceased.

5. Grandparents: George Danies—Deceased; Lucy Danies—Deceased; Narbal Boucard—Deceased; Leoni Boucard—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Alexandra Hepler, 0.

---

*James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Nominee: James Randolph Evans.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and amount:

Self, Spouse, Children and Spouses, Parents, Grandparents, Brothers and Spouses, Sisters and Spouses: See Attachment A

ATTACHMENT A

Linda Evans, John McCallum for Congress, 2013–$1,000.

Linda Evans, Pridemore for Congress, 2013–$1,000.

Linda Evans, The Guardian Fund, 2013–$1,000.

Linda Evans, Westmoreland, Lynn A., 2013–$1,000.

Linda Evans, Shannon for Senate, 2014–$1,000.

Linda Evans, Nathan Deal for Governor, Inc., 2014–$6,300.

J. Randolph Evans, Republican National Committee, 2012–$2,500.

J. Randolph Evans, Republican National Committee, 2013–$32,400.00.

J. Randolph Evans, Republican National Committee, 2014–$32,400.00.

J. Randolph Evans, Republican National Committee, 2015–$25,000.00.

J. Randolph Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2016–$270.

J. Randolph Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2016–$750.

J. Randolph Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2016–$1,000.

J. Randolph Evans, Republican Party, Inc., 2017–$225.

James Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2012, $800.00.

James Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2012, $1,000.00.

James Randolph Evans, Republican National Committee, 2016, $350.

Randy Evans, Romney for President, Inc., 2012, $2,500.

Randy Evans, Republican National Committee, 2013, $350.

Randy Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2013, $125.

Randy Evans, Nathan Deal for Governor, Inc., Primary 2014, $6,300.

Randy Evans, Nathan Deal for Governor, Inc., General 2014, $6,300.

Randy Evans, Senate District 12, 2015, $500.

Randy Evans, Republican National Committee, 2016, $300.

Randy Evans, Republican National Committee, 2016, $300.

Randy Evans, Republican National Committee, 2016, $19,600.

Randy Evans, Georgia Republican Party, 2016, $130.

Randy Evans, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., 2016, $2,700.

Randy Evans, Trump for President, 2016, $25,000.

Randy Evans, Georgia Republican Party, 2016, $270.

Randy Evans, Georgia Republican Party, 2016, $750.

Randy Evans, Georgia Republican Party, 2016, $1,000.

---

*Richard Grenell, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Nominee: Richard Allen Grenell.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Germany.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: $1,000, 6/19/2013, Lindsey Graham; $250, 9/11/2013, Mitch McConnell; $1,000, 9/16/2014, Ed Royce; $5,400, 6/05/2015, Rob Portman; $1,000, 6/11/2005, John McCain.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: None.

4. Parents: Judith Grenell, None; Denny Grenell—Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Nate Grenell—Deceased; Esther Grenell—Deceased; Rueben Pearson—Deceased; Gladys Pearson—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Bradley Grenell, None; Jeffrey Grenell, None; Kerri Grenell, None; Jane Grenell, None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Deborah Grenell Kells, None; Dennis Kells, None.

---

*Samuel Dale Brownback, of Kansas, to be Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom.

*Yleem D. S. Poblete, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Verification and Compliance).

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDs on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Marc Clayton Gilkey and ending with Mark A. Myers, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2018.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Alyce S. Ahn and ending with Michele D. Woonacott, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2018.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Priya U. Amin and ending with Erik Z. Zahnen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2018.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Angela P. Aggeler and ending with Mari Jain Womack, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2018. (minus 1 nominee: Robert F. Grech)

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Barbara Stewart, of Illinois, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

*William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, for a term of four years.

*James Blew, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Department of Education.

*Brett Giroir, of Texas, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

*Kenneth L. Marcus, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

*Scott A. Mugno, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

*Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor.

*Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

*Mitchell Zais, of South Carolina, to be Deputy Secretary of Education.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Stuart Kyle Duncan, of Louisiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Annemarie Carney Axon, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

Thomas Alvin Farr, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

William M. Ray II, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Liles Clifton Burke, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

Michael Joseph Juneau, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Emily Coody Marks, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama.

Jeffrey Uhlman Beaverstock, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama.

Holly Lou Teeter, of Kansas, to be United States District Judge for the District of Kansas.

Terry Fitzgerald Moorer, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama.

Mark Saalfield Norris, Sr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

R. Stan Baker, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia.

Charles Barnes Goodwin, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Matthew J. Kacsmaryk, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Eli Jeremy Richardson, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Jeffrey Bossert Clark, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Eric S. Dreiband, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

John H. Durham, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years.

Michael T. Baylous, of West Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of West Virginia for the term of four years.

Daniel R. McKittrick, of Mississippi, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. LEE, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2319. A bill to empower States to manage the development and production of oil and gas on available Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the national limitation amount for qualified highway or surface freight transfer facility bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2321. A bill to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to require the development of ethics plans for certain transition teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 2322. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to define the term natural cheese; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 2323. A bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits and services in the event of a Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2324. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to change certain requirements relating to the capital structure of business development companies, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise certain rules relating to business development companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 374. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 12, 2018, as ''Darwin Day'' and recognizing the importance of science in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. Res. 375. A resolution congratulating the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team for winning the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 14

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 14, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans.

S. 892

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 892, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to establish additional registration requirements for prescribers of opioids, and for other purposes.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 915, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1576

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1576, a bill to provide that the owner of a water right may use the water for the cultivation of industrial hemp, if otherwise authorized by State law.

S. 2055

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2055, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to better address substance use and substance use disorders among young people.

S. 2121

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2121, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require reporting of certain data by providers and suppliers of air ambulance services for purposes of reforming reimbursements for such services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2122

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2122, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 regarding reasonable break time for nursing mothers.

S. 2147

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 2147, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2152

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2152, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for assistance for victims of child pornography, and for other purposes.

S. 2159

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2159, a bill to require covered harassment and covered discrimination awareness and prevention training for Members, officers, employees, interns, fellows, and detailees of Congress within 30 days of employment and annually thereafter, to require a biennial climate survey of Congress, to amend the enforcement process under the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights for covered harassment and covered discrimination complaints, and for other purposes.

S. 2174

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2174, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the Veterans Crisis Line.

S. 2194

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2194, a bill to remove a limitation on a prohibition relating to permits for discharges incidental to normal operation of vessels.

S. 2236

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2236, a bill to require covered discrimination and covered harassment awareness and prevention training for Members, officers, employees, interns, fellows, and detailees of Congress within 30 days of employment and annually thereafter, to require a biennial climate survey of Congress, to amend the enforcement process under the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights for covered discrimination and covered harassment complaints, and for other purposes.

S. 2250

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2250, a bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful detention based solely on a protected characteristic.

S. 2254

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2254, a bill to prevent unfair double taxation by ensuring that the deduction for State and local taxes is not reduced, suspended, or eliminated.

S. 2271

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2271, a bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2274, a bill to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

S. 2317

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2317, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for additional flexibility with respect to medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorders, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 368

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 368, a resolution supporting the right of all Iranian citizens to have their voices heard.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. LEE, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2319. A bill to empower States to manage the development and production of oil and gas on available Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I wish to speak today about legislation I am introducing to spur American energy development on Federal land. This is the Opportunities for the Nation and States to Harness Onshore Resources for Energy Act. It is also known as the ONSHORE Act. It is a commonsense approach that streamlines the permitting process for oil and gas development.

Oil and gas production has increased dramatically on non-Federal land in recent years. Production on Federal land has fallen behind. That is because energy producers face costly delays when they have to deal with outdated and inefficient regulations from Washington, DC.

The legislation we are introducing reduces these unnecessary delays by giving authority to States that have established regulatory programs. Let's let the States make those decisions. These are States that have a proven track record of managing oil and gas development efficiently and effectively. At the same time, they protect the public health and the environment. That is the balance we all want—and these States are doing it—without Washington adding another unnecessary layer of redtape.

In 2016, it took an average of more than 250 days for the Federal Bureau of Land Management to issue permits to drill for oil on public land. It took State agencies an average of 30 days. Look at the difference—States, 30 days; Federal, 250 days. That is the difference in what happens when Washington gets involved. The delays cost jobs, they slow down economic growth, and communities lose important tax revenue.

My home State of Wyoming is America's largest producer of natural gas, and we are the second largest producer of oil on Federal lands. Wyoming has a long history of managing oil and gas development on Federal lands. We know how to do it. We do it safely. We do it responsibly. Wyoming continues to be the place people from all over the world want to see because of how beautiful the scenery and the environment are. This legislation strips away that needless layer of Washington regulation, and it lets States like Wyoming manage oil and gas development the way we know how to do it.

Our legislation also eliminates the administrative fee that gets taken out of States' share of revenues from oil and gas production. Washington takes money that has been created locally, and it sends the money out of the community and back to Washington. This is millions of dollars that States and local communities need to fund vital public services. Our bill ends this unfair redistribution.

The ONSHORE Act also stops Washington from imposing extra permitting burdens and environmental reviews on energy development that takes place on non-Federal lands. These requirements are a classic example of Washington overreach. They don't help the environment; they just keep oil and gas in the ground and keep hard-working Americans out of work. This legislation will create jobs and expand our economy by creating an environment where American energy can dominate.

I want to thank the cosponsors of this legislation for their support—Senators HOEVEN, ENZI, LEE, and HATCH. I also want to thank my colleagues in the House for starting this conversation with their bill, which is called the SECURE American Energy Act. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this legislation as quickly as possible.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the national limitation amount for qualified highway or surface freight transfer facility bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2320

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Building United States Infrastructure and Leveraging Development Act'' or the ''BUILD Act''.

SEC. 2. INCREASE NATIONAL LIMITATION AMOUNT FOR QUALIFIED HIGHWAY OR SURFACE FREIGHT TRANSFER FACILITY BONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 142(m)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''$15,000,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,800,000,000''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to bonds issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 374—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 12, 2018, AS ''DARWIN DAY'' AND RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENCE IN THE BETTERMENT OF HUMANITY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 374

Whereas Charles Darwin developed the theory of evolution by the mechanism of natural selection, which, together with the monumental amount of scientific evidence Charles Darwin compiled to support the theory, provides humanity with a logical and intellectually compelling explanation for the diversity of life on Earth;

Whereas the validity of the theory of evolution by natural selection developed by Charles Darwin is further strongly supported by the modern understanding of the science of genetics;

Whereas it has been the human curiosity and ingenuity exemplified by Charles Darwin that has promoted new scientific discoveries that have helped humanity solve many problems and improve living conditions;

Whereas the advancement of science must be protected from those unconcerned with the adverse impacts of global warming and climate change;

Whereas the teaching of creationism in some public schools compromises the scientific and academic integrity of the education systems of the United States;

Whereas Charles Darwin is a worthy symbol of scientific advancement on which to focus and around which to build a global celebration of science and humanity intended to promote a common bond among all the people of the Earth; and

Whereas February 12, 2018, is the anniversary of the birth of Charles Darwin in 1809 and would be an appropriate date to designate as ''Darwin Day'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of ''Darwin Day''; and

(2) recognizes Charles Darwin as a worthy symbol on which to celebrate the achievements of reason, science, and the advancement of human knowledge.

SENATE RESOLUTION 375—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA CRIMSON TIDE FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2018 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYOFF NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 375

Whereas the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team won the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship, defeating the University of Georgia Bulldogs by a score of 26 to 23 at the Mercedes-Benz Stadium in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 10, 2018;

Whereas this victory marks the fifth College Football National Championship in the last 9 years for the University of Alabama and the 17th National Championship overall;

Whereas the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship was the 69th postseason football bowl appearance and the 39th football bowl victory for the University of Alabama;

Whereas the 2017–2018 Crimson Tide football team consistently showed perseverance in the midst of adversity, including overcoming a 13-point deficit in the second half of the National Championship game;

Whereas the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship game was the first National Championship game to extend into overtime;

Whereas head coach Nick Saban has now won 6 College Football National Championships, equaling the modern-era record of former University of Alabama football head coach Paul ''Bear'' Bryant;

Whereas this victory extends the record of Coach Saban to 127 wins and 20 losses in a decade of dominance;

Whereas ''The Process'', as outlined by Coach Saban, has produced not only quality student-athletes, but well-rounded young men;

Whereas members of the 2017–2018 Crimson Tide football team have been honored by various awards throughout the season and during the postseason;

Whereas Chancellor Ray Hayes, President Stuart Bell, and Athletic Director Greg Byrne have emphasized the importance of academic success to the Crimson Tide football team and to all student-athletes at the University of Alabama; and

Whereas the 2017–2018 Crimson Tide football team has brought great pride and honor to the University of Alabama, the loyal fans of the Crimson Tide, and the entire State of Alabama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Alabama Crimson Tide for winning the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship game;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all players, coaches, and staff who contributed to the championship season; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate prepare an official copy of this resolution for presentation to—

(A) the President of the University of Alabama, Dr. Stuart Bell;

(B) the Athletic Director of the University of Alabama, Greg Byrne; and

(C) the Head Coach of the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team, Nick Saban.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1903. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.

SA 1904. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1903 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

SA 1905. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

SA 1906. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1905 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

SA 1907. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1906 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 1905 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1903. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.''

SA 1904. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1903 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''

SA 1905. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.''

SA 1906. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1905 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''

SA 1907. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1906 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the

amendment SA 1905 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike ''4'' and insert ''5''

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michael D. Griffin, of Alabama, to be Under Secretary for Research and Engineering, Phyllis L. Bayer, of Mississippi, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and John Henderson, of South Dakota, and William Roper, of Georgia, each to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, all of the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''CFIUS Reform: Examining the essential elements.''

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 11 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Leon A. Westmoreland, of Georgia, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, Barry Lee Myers, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Diana Furchtgott-Roth, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, Brendan Carr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, James Bridenstine, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Commissioner, and to be Chairman, and Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner, both of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Samuel Dale Brownback, of Kansas, to be Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, Richard Grenell, of California, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, Yleem D. S. Poblete, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Verification and Compliance), James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg, Joel Danies, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, Carlos Trujillo, of Florida, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, and routine lists in the Foreign Service, all of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Melissa F. Burnison, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs), and Anne Marie White, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary (Environmental Management), both of the Department of Energy.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSION

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Financial Aid Simplification and Transparency.''

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSION

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 12:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing subcommittee assignments and on the following nominations: Mitchell Zais, of South Carolina, to be Deputy Secretary, Kenneth L. Marcus, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, and James Blew, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, all of the Department of Education, Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary, Scott A. Mugno, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary, Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, all of the Department of Labor, Brett Giroir, of Texas, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, and to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, Barbara Stewart, of Illinois, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service, and other pending nominations.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the House has sent us a bill that should be an easy ''yes'' vote for every Senator in this Chamber—an easy ''yes'' vote. This bill continues government funding, prevents a needless shutdown, and extends a key health insurance program for vulnerable children for 6 years. Its content is bipartisan. There are no provisions that any of my Democratic friends oppose. It is a simple step that will let us continue bipartisan talks without throwing the government into disarray for no reason.

Americans are surprised this is even a debate. I don't blame them. I share their surprise that some Democratic Senators see the prospect of a government shutdown for more than 300 million Americans, see a possible lapse in health coverage for 9 million vulnerable American kids, and they have attempted to hold all of that hostage until we resolve a nonimminent problem related to illegal immigration.

The surprise is compounded for anyone who listens to the public statements of my Democratic colleagues and takes them at their word. Less than a week ago, the senior Senator from Colorado was asked whether it was prudent to shut the government down over the issue of illegal immigration. He insisted it was not.

Last month, my friend, the senior Senator from West Virginia, had this to say: ''I'm not going to make 300 million people suffer because I can't get the process working the way it should.''

The junior Senator from Virginia put it even more clearly. This is what he had to say: ''I will exercise every bit of leverage I can . . . but if there is a vote that would lead to a shutdown, that is where I draw the line.''

Not more than 2 days ago, the senior Senator from Missouri said she wasn't ''interested in drawing a line in the sand'' because ''that's how negotiations get blown up.''

Well, I hope their votes this evening reflect those recent statements.

Some of my colleagues say they are reluctant to support this measure not because of illegal immigration but simply because they are tired of continuing resolutions. They point out that this is a suboptimal way to fund our government, especially our warfighters.

That is precisely why Republicans worked hard all last month and all this month—all last month and all this month—to try to negotiate a long-term spending caps agreement that would bring stability back to government funding, but the Democratic leadership made it clear they would not be serious about these spending talks until this unrelated immigration issue was solved.

So now, unfortunately, a continuing resolution is the only option our Armed Forces have this evening. Let's not pretend for a moment—not a moment—that our men and women in uniform and their families benefit from a government shutdown.

This is how we got here. My Democratic colleagues' demand on illegal immigration, at the behest of their far-left base, have crowded out all other important business. They have crowded it all out over the issue of illegal immigration. Now they are threatening to crowd out the needs of veterans, military families, opioid treatment centers, and every other American who relies on the Federal Government, all over illegal immigration.

There is no imminent deadline facing the DACA Program. Congress has at least until March to arrive at a bipartisan solution that is acceptable to Republicans, Democrats, and the person who needs to sign the bill—the President of the United States. Do veterans, opioid treatment centers, and the families of fallen soldiers need to suffer before a compromise is reached?

Democratic Senators' fixation on illegal immigration has already blocked us from making progress on long-term spending talks. Now, that same fixation over illegal immigration has them threatening to filibuster funding for the whole government.

Years ago, my friend, the Democratic leader, described how irresponsible it would be to shut down the government over the issue of immigration. He said it would result in ''governmental chaos.'' That is what my friend, the Democratic leader, said a while back, but earlier today on the floor, he insisted that we put every other American priority on hold—put it on hold—until we resolve immigration. Only then, he said, can we work on defense spending or domestic spending or CHIP or disaster relief—put all of that on hold over the issue of illegal immigration with no imminent deadline. It only needs to be addressed by March.

Well, that is apparently how our Democratic colleagues rank their priorities. It is not how I would rank mine. I don't think it is how many of our colleagues on either side would rank theirs either, but we will have a chance to find out in the coming days.

It is certainly not how the American people expect us to act. I think the American people clearly would not expect us to act this way.

The bill before us is an opportunity to correct course. It is a chance for my colleagues to remember that we represent millions and millions of American citizens.

The American people want the Federal Government open for veterans, military families, and the vulnerable. They want food and drug inspections to continue without interruption. They want death benefits to continue to go out to the families of servicemembers killed in action. They want children in low-income families to continue receiving health coverage through SCHIP. They want a sensible compromise on immigration. But they cannot for the life of them understand why—why—some Senators would hold the entire country hostage until we arrive at a solution to a problem that doesn't fully materialize until March.

Military families, veterans, and children benefiting from the SCHIP program don't need to be shoved aside—they don't need to be shoved aside—while we continue good-faith negotiations. So we ought to pass this resolution, and we ought to get back to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I will have much more to say after this vote on the motion to proceed, which Democrats will support because we want to move forward. We want to get something done. We don't want to keep kicking the can down the road. But I just had to answer the leader, briefly.

The leader is looking to deflect blame, but it just won't work. We all know what the problem is; it is complete disarray on the Republican side.

The bottom line is very simple. Our Republican leader has said that he will not negotiate until he knows where President Trump stands. That is why negotiations haven't gotten anywhere. Let me quote. Here is what the leader said just yesterday: ''I am looking for something that President Trump is going to support, and he has not yet indicated what measure he is willing to sign.'' MITCH MCCONNELL said that he still has to ''figure out what the President is for.'' How can you negotiate when the President, who has to sign the legislation, is like a sphinx on this issue or says one thing one day and one thing the next?

So here is what we can do to solve the problem. We could solve it right now. The four leaders could sit down—there has been a lot of discussion—and come to an agreement and do what the President said at one point: Send it to his desk and he will sign it. We could get that done before the deadline of tomorrow night expires, or we could give the President a few days to come to the table, now that he knows this plan won't work, and we could get this done in a few short days and not kick the can down the road.

This is the fourth CR that we have done and accomplished nothing. There is no promise and no likelihood that another kicking of the can down the road will get something done. We have to sit down together and solve this, with the President or without. Until that happens, no amount of CRs will get this done.

I would suggest we all vote for the motion to proceed but instead move a very short-term CR, and we will either negotiate it ourselves or the President will join us, and we can get the job done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, not to prolong the debate, but the Presidency under our constitutional system is not irrelevant. He is the person who signs things into law. And most of us in the House and Senate on the Republican side are interested in what his views are, and those have not been made fully apparent yet.

What we have before us deals with a real emergency—tomorrow night at midnight. What our friends on the other side are pushing is not an emergency. It doesn't have anything to do with what is before us. It is completely irrelevant to the issue of avoiding a government shutdown and taking care of 300 million Americans, most of whom depend on the government in one way or another.

FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand the Senate has received a message from the House to accompany H.R. 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 195 and ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Durbin	Manchin
Baldwin	Enzi	Markey
Barrasso	Ernst	McCaskill
Bennet	Feinstein	McConnell
Blumenthal	Fischer	Menendez
Blunt	Flake	Merkley
Booker	Gardner	Moran
Boozman	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Brown	Graham	Murphy
Burr	Grassley	Murray
Cantwell	Harris	Nelson
Capito	Hassan	Perdue
Cardin	Hatch	Peters
Carper	Heinrich	Portman
Casey	Heitkamp	Reed
Cassidy	Heller	Risch
Cochran	Hirono	Roberts
Collins	Hoeven	Rounds
Coons	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Sanders
Cornyn	Johnson	Sasse
Cortez Masto	Jones	Schatz
Cotton	Kaine	Schumer
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott
Cruz	King	Shaheen
Daines	Klobuchar	Shelby
Donnelly	Lankford	Smith
Duckworth	Leahy	Stabenow

Sullivan	Udall	Wicker
Tester	Van Hollen	Wyden
Thune	Warner	Young
Tillis	Warren	
Toomey	Whitehouse	

NAYS—2

Lee	Paul

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the Message from the House.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 195) entitled ''An Act to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.'', with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

I ask unanimous consent that there now be up to 10 minutes of debate, equally divided, on the motion to concur and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the motion to concur with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would simply like to read a statement from Dana W. White, chief Pentagon spokesperson:

> We have been working under a Continuing Resolution for three years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow, 19 Jan. This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully-funded FY18 budget or face ramifications on our military.

The leader wants to move that very CR that the Pentagon objects to even without a 60-vote margin. I strenuously object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Richard C. Shelby, Tom Cotton, Joni Ernst, James M. Inhofe, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Roy Blunt.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1903

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, with an amendment numbered 1903.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1904 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1903

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1904 to amendment No. 1903.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1905

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to refer the House message on H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer the House message on H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions, being amendment numbered 1905.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

''This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1906

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1906 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1907 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1906

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1907 to amendment No. 1906.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike ''4'' and insert ''5''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, to delay a vote on cloture makes no sense when we all know the outcome. The government's funding expires tomorrow night at midnight. Let's vote tonight on cloture so we can move forward so, perhaps, we can bring the President to the table—if not, so we can undergo serious negotiations to get things done.

You have just heard from the Pentagon. The Pentagon thinks this CR is wrong for our military. This is again the statement from Dana White, the chief Pentagon spokesperson. I want to repeat it so my colleagues can all hear it.

> We have been working under a Continuing Resolution for three years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow, 19 Jan. This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully-funded FY18 budget or face ramifications on our military.

Because of the urgent needs we face—the military and so many of the others: opioids, veterans, pensions—we should not delay any further. We should move cloture tonight and see the outcome—I think we all know it will be defeated—and start serious negotiations tomorrow morning. That is what we should do.

I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived and that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motion filed on the motion to

concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195 ripen at 10 p.m. on Thursday, January 18—10 p.m. tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the leader addressed extensively what was happening before the vote on the motion to proceed. I would like to address that now.

The House of Representatives has sent the Senate a continuing resolution that has been constructed by the Republican Speaker and passed without the consultation of House Democrats or Senate Democrats, whatsoever. The Republican leader is now saying to us: Take it or leave it.

Here is why Members from both sides of the aisle want to leave it. We have been skating by on continuing resolution after continuing resolution for almost 6 months. First, we passed a 3-month CR. Then we passed a 2-week CR and then a 1-month CR. Now we are offering another month-long delay of the inevitable.

We cannot keep kicking the can down the road and shuffling our feet after it. In another month, we will be right back here at this moment with the same web of problems at our feet and in no better position to solve them. The government of the most powerful nation in the world should, simply, not be run this way.

These successive, short-term funding bills hurt our military, as I have mentioned. Just ask Secretary Mattis if this is what he would prefer we do—another continuing resolution—or an honest to goodness budget that allows our Defense Department to plan ahead and meet its obligations. We all know he would prefer the latter.

That is why some of my Republican colleagues have already said they join with Democrats to reject this bill. They know, like I know, that this is no way to do our business. This is not a partisan issue. We should be united in trying to come to a solution, not just kick the can down the road.

The truth is that we don't have to do it this way. In his speech earlier, the majority leader, my friend, tried to reduce this to a binary choice: Take my bill or else shut down the government.

That is not the case. It is simply not. These aren't the only options available to him or to any of us. Democrats and Republicans have been negotiating for months about several issues. A bipartisan deal is within reach on lifting the caps for both defense and domestic spending, on healthcare issues, on disaster relief, on immigration issues. A bipartisan deal is within reach. I have been a part of those negotiations on all of these issues, and now is the time to reach it, not a month from now.

One reason we haven't gotten one already, frankly, is that the President has been impervious to compromise for several months. Another is that he cannot maintain a consistent position. We all know that. He accepts bipartisan overtures on one day only to reject them on the next. He makes and then rescinds and then remakes demands. He encourages compromise one day only to thwart it the next by saying he will only accept a deal that gives him 100 percent of what he wants. That is not what a great deal maker does.

Folks, the people in Congress in his own party don't even know what he wants. I feel for them. I feel for our leader. He is in an awful, difficult position. I know that. We all know that. Yesterday, Leader MCCONNELL said that he is still trying to figure out what the President is for. Only a few moments ago, the leader said the President's views have not been made fully apparent yet. Letting this ambivalence and chaos continue for another month is just not the answer. It is not a good way to get a deal. It is not the right way to run our country—our dear, beloved country.

Tonight or tomorrow, the President will see—I had hoped it would be tonight; we cannot waste any time—that this approach was rejected on a bipartisan basis. Hopefully, he will see the light, come to the table, and negotiate seriously for the first time in this lengthy process.

Ultimately, the answer here might be to pursue an idea that has been floated by a few of my Republican colleagues—pass a clean extension of government funding for 4 or 5 days to give us a hard, final deadline to finalize a deal. Passing a short-term continuing resolution ensures that both sides remain at the table and can quickly reach a deal that funds our military, our domestic priorities, like the fight against opioids, that protects Dreamers, and that funds healthcare and aid for those harmed by recent disasters. Everyone in this Chamber wants some of those things, if not all.

Frankly, I think we can still solve this by the deadline tomorrow. As my friend from South Carolina said: We could solve all of this in 30 minutes if only folks were willing. It may not quite be 30 minutes, but knowing the negotiations as I do, we could do it rather quickly. Certainly, it wouldn't take us 30 days.

Hopefully, after the CR goes down, folks will be willing, and with a little more time on our hands, maybe the majority leader—we are trying to help you, MITCH—can pin down just what President Trump wants in order to get a deal. Nobody wants to shut down the government. Democrats don't want to shut down the government, and Republicans don't want to shut down the government. I believe that sincerely. The only person who has ever rooted for a shutdown, frankly, is our President, who said our country could use a good shutdown. Only President Trump could come up with that phrasing. Nobody else thinks it is a good shutdown. Of course, no shutdown can be good for the American people. Let us strive to avoid one.

I urge my colleagues to reject this measure for the reasons I mentioned. It was not fair. We were not consulted. It was take it or leave it. That is not how it should work. That is how almost none of us want this to work.

If we cannot figure this out by tomorrow night, I urge the majority leader, in particular, and the majority to support a clean extension of funding for a few days so that we can finally come to a resolution and get down to so many of the other things that we need to do in this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this is not terribly complicated.

We have been in discussions for a couple of months on all of the issues that are urgent—the funding of the government, the Children's Health Insurance Program—and other matters that we all know need to be dealt with.

My good friend, the Democratic leader, is saying we have had too many continuing resolutions but suggests we pass yet another one, and the bill that is before us that we just voted to proceed to, I believe, enjoys the support—every element of it enjoys the support of almost everybody on both sides of the aisle. So it is appropriate to ask the question, Why are we where we are? There is only one reason: the continuous interjection of an issue, about which there is no urgency, into a discussion about how to deal with a potpourri of issues that do need to be urgently met, and that is the issue of illegal immigration.

So what our friends on the other side are saying is, they are prepared to shut down the government over the issue of illegal immigration. On that issue, there is a bipartisan interest in solving the DACA problem, but the President has given us until March. The last time I looked this was January. My colleagues, where is the urgency here? There isn't any.

So the reason these talks have gone on so long is because they have insisted, continuously, on throwing the illegal immigration issue into the pool of these other issues and are now saying to the American people: We are going to shut the government down if we can't have our way on this issue right now, even though it only becomes a problem in March.

So I hope the American people understand why we are where we are. No amount of trying to obfuscate this and confuse it with all of these other issues makes any sense at all. There is pretty broad bipartisan agreement that we need to address every single one of these issues, but the reason we are here right now is, our friends on the other side say: Solve this illegal immigration problem right now or we are going to shut the government down. That is a

fact. That is not spin. That is a fact. That is the only reason why we are where we are tonight. So I hope the American people will not be confused about this.

We want to fund the government. We want to solve the S-CHIP problem and a variety of other issues that almost all others agree on, and we wanted to do it before tomorrow night, but my assumption is at some point between now and tomorrow night, 41 Members of the opposition party are going to prevent us from passing a measure, the details of which they all support, because they can't get their way on this illegal immigration issue which really only becomes urgent in March.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, just a brief rejoinder. First, there have been very good attempts, bipartisan attempts to solve this problem. Three Democrats and three Republicans met the problem right in the middle. It was the other side, your side, Leader, that didn't want to go along with that agreement. It was a fair and decent agreement in which each side gave. It is an important agreement. It is a vital agreement, and no one—no one—no one—has figured out a way to pass a bill independently in February. Any vote, any bill that might get a majority of the Republicans in the House on this issue will not get Democrats, and any bill that gets a majority of Democrats will not get a majority of the Republican side in the House and will not be put on the floor. So this is the way to go on that issue, but there are many other issues out here too. Make no mistake about it.

Opioids. Our national lifespan rate has declined, how long we live has declined because of opioids. We haven't funded it. Every one of us in our States knows we need that. This resolution does nothing on opioids.

Veterans. In my State and in your States, veterans are waiting in line for treatment after they risked their lives for us. This resolution doesn't fund it. You say: Well, maybe we will do it after a month, but we sure haven't done it for 6 months.

What about pensions? The millions of Americans, working people, who have paid in month after month who lost salary—they declined salary increases so they would know they could live a life of decency—hardly wealth—when they retire, that is being extinguished. We have an urgent obligation to deal with those people. We feel it, and I know many people on the other side feel it.

There are so many other issues. Healthcare issues. I see my friend from Maine. We had a discussion last night, and I talked subsequently to my friend from Washington State and my friend from Florida. We could come to an arrangement on that rather quickly and deal with that issue.

Disaster relief for Texas, for Florida, for Puerto Rico, and for the West. We need to deal with that issue as well. So there are lots of issues to deal with, and on all of these important issues, all of them, this resolution kicks the can down the road and gives us no reason to believe it will be any different than the first CR, the second CR, the third CR, and the fourth CR.

What we are proposing is not original with us. It was proposed by three or four Members on that side of the aisle. A very short-term increase would force the President to the table, hopefully, because that has been the barrier, in the words of the majority leader, for solving the DACA problem and other issues and would get us to act. These are not such easy issues. Without a deadline, we may never get them done, and the fears of the Pentagon, so well stated tonight by the DOD spokesperson, will get worse and worse and worse.

So I would, in an act of bipartisanship—not accusing one side or the other—I didn't accuse one side or the other of shutting down the government. I am not trying to play for political points, even false ones. I am trying to get us to come together in a bipartisan nature to get something done. I hope all of us on both sides of the aisle rise to the occasion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Democratic leader has mentioned a variety of issues, all of which were being discussed over the last 2 months in the hopes that we could reach an agreement to address them all. So now, I gather, he is saying he opposes the bill because it doesn't have everything we have been talking about in it, even though the things that are in the bill he does like. So the complaint now is, it doesn't have the other issues in it. The reason it doesn't have the other issues in it is because we haven't been able to reach a global agreement on how much we are going to spend.

These talks have been going on endlessly. Many of you have not been involved in them. We are exhausted. On and on and on we have been talking about all this—everything the Democratic leader has mentioned. Why will they never let us reach an agreement? Illegal immigration. That is what they shoehorned into all this—shoehorned that issue right into this and said: We will not solve any of this other stuff until we deal with this.

Now I gather the Democratic leader is questioning the good faith of some of us about whether we want to deal with the DACA issue. I do. I see Senator COTTON back here, Senator TILLIS—I think we all would like to deal with the DACA issue, but there are some serious problems with legal immigration, and this is a big enough issue to warrant being discussed all by itself without being shoehorned into a bill full of real emergencies because there is no real emergency in the immigration area. We have until March to deal with it.

So make no mistake about it, we are where we are for one reason and one reason only, within a day of a government shutdown, and that is the insistence of our friends on the other side that we deal with this nonemergency right now because they were unwilling to close out all of these other issues we have been discussing ad nauseam, literally for months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the majority leader clarifying for us what this is all about, and actually I have to thank the Democratic leader for clarifying that this is really about the issue of illegal immigration. That is the reason there has been no agreement on spending caps, because our friends across the aisle don't want to agree on spending caps because they want to use everything else as leverage in order to get an outcome on this dispute over illegal immigration.

As the majority leader pointed out, this isn't so much about what is in the bill as what they said should be in the bill because I presume our colleagues are for the 6-year reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, which was voted almost unanimously out on a bipartisan basis in the Senate Finance Committee. The matter of veterans that the Democratic leader mentioned—well, veterans are going to be hurt by what they have done or will do tomorrow, I presume, in defeating this 1-month continuing resolution.

I find it rather disingenuous to say we are against this short-term continuing resolution because we want another short-term continuing resolution, guaranteeing that there will yet again be another short-term resolution. Once the spending caps are agreed to, it is going to take a couple of weeks for the bill to be put together so we can actually vote on it. So our colleagues across the aisle who say they want another 3- or 4-day continuing resolution, that guarantees yet another continuing resolution, and all of this is really camouflage to hide their true intention—as the majority leader pointed out—trying to force a decision where there is yet not consensus and a willingness of the President to support it on the issue of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. That deadline for people who can no longer re-sign up is March 5. In the meantime, nobody is in any jeopardy, none of the 690,000 young people who were brought here as children are in any kind of jeopardy, and we are having discussions on a daily basis. We had one today with Senator DURBIN. STENY HOYER, the Democratic whip; the majority leader in the House, KEVIN MCCARTHY; and I again met with the White House and Department of Homeland Security to try to make some progress, and I think there was the beginning of some real progress toward a resolution.

I find it disingenuous to try to claim that we are killing this 1-month CR,

continuing resolution, because we don't want to hurt the military. This damages the military because it creates further chaos and uncertainty when it comes to a long-term spending deal because our military has been underfunded for way too long. Why? Because our Democratic colleagues will not agree to fund our national defense until we agree to raise spending on nondefense matters. So it strikes me as very odd that you would say you are voting against this continuing resolution because you are against continuing resolutions only to guarantee that we will have at least two more and then to claim it is about something else, when really it is about the matter of illegal immigration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that what we are trying to achieve is fund the military and critical agencies of our government immediately and to do it with a budget, to do it with appropriations bills. I have to use that term and remind you, yes, we used to have appropriations bills in the U.S. Senate—not anymore. We deal with continuing resolutions, we lurch from week to week, day to day, month to month, and as the Secretary of Defense has told us, we are not doing the men and women of the military any favors with this kind of approach. Make no mistake about it, the Democrats are soundly behind national security, and we want to fund them properly rather than the way they have been funded to this date.

Let me address another issue that has been raised—and my name has been mentioned by my friend from Texas. It has been said on the floor tonight that there is no urgency. Where's the urgency when it comes to DACA? Where is the urgency when it comes to Dreamers? If you want to know the urgency, look into the Gallery behind me. Look at the people who have gathered here late this night, who are following every word that we are debating. Why are they here if there is no urgency?

There is an urgency. There is an urgency in their lives because of the uncertainty of tomorrow—whether tomorrow will mean deportation for themselves and their families, whether they will be able to work, complete school, have a life in America. Yes, there is a real urgency, and let me tell you what we have done about that urgency.

A group of us—three Democrats and three Republican Senators—sat down 4 months ago to answer President Trump's challenge to replace DACA. Was there a meeting of a committee in this Senate on the same subject? There was one public hearing, but no bill, no markup, nothing. The activity really came from and evolved from the six of us working together—three Democrats and three Republicans. We reached an agreement. It wasn't easy. Ask the Senators involved on your side of the aisle or on our side of the aisle. We have presented it to the Senate, we have defended it over the last several weeks, and I want to thank the additional four Republican Senators who have joined us in this effort to finally enact a bipartisan solution to this. So to say that we have done nothing and we have so much time—let me tell you, there is a sense of urgency here.

Just this week, when the Secretary of DHS testified before the Judiciary Committee, she conceded the fact that the President does not have authority to extend this deadline of March 5, that we are going back and forth in court as to whether there will be any protection for these young people whatsoever, and she acknowledged that her Department has said that it will take them 6 months to write the regulations once we pass the law that will affect their lives and the lives of hundreds of thousands.

You know how I feel about this issue. Some of you have presided over the Senate, have seen the presentations we have made over the years. I have brought 107 photographs to the floor so that people could see the urgency and need for this issue now. It is sad; it is unfortunate that those who stand on the floor tonight continue to characterize these as illegal immigrants—illegal immigrants. Children, toddlers, infants brought to the United States, who have lived their whole lives here and are simply asking for a chance to be part of our future, are being swept away as illegal immigrants. They are more than that. They are the sons and daughters of America who want to be part of our future. They are people who inspire me every day. They are folks who guarantee us that the American Dream will be alive for another generation because they are willing to work for it, to study for it, and to fight for it. This is worth our attention.

We have produced this bipartisan measure. A lot of hard work went into it. We would simply ask that the Senate take up the measure that we produced or produce a better one, and the leadership has refused. That is part of the reason we find ourselves at this moment, but I want to assure you, it is an urgent matter. Their lives matter too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRASSO). The majority leader.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Friday, January 19; 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 resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KING. I don't understand why we are adjourning when we are in this urgent situation. We could vote tonight on cloture and have an entire day tomorrow to work on this matter. This is irresponsible, and I just don't understand it, so I object to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous consent request that I propounded earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 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 10:15 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 19, 2018, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

KENNETH STEVEN BARBIC, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, VICE TODD A. BATTA, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

THOMAS E. AYRES, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE GORDON O. TANNER.

JAMES N. STEWART, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE TODD A. WEILER.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

JOHN F. RING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2022, VICE PHILIP ANDREW MISCIMARRA, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICES

MICHAEL STOKER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR, VICE ALLISON BECK, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

FRANCIS R. FANNON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (ENERGY RESOURCES), VICE JOHN STERN WOLF.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JOHNATHAN MILLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE LINDA I. ETIM.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

JACKIE WOLCOTT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

UNITED NATIONS

JACKIE WOLCOTT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE VIENNA OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL L. AHMANN
COL. PETER G. BAILEY
COL. MALINDA M. BEGGS
COL. ERIC L. BRATU
COL. BENJAMIN M. CASON
COL. MARK A. CHIDLEY
COL. TROY T. DANIELS
COL. NICHOLAS A. GENTILE, JR.
COL. THOMAS F. GRABOWSKI
COL. ANDREW W. LOVE
COL. RICHARD R. NEELY
COL. RUSSELL L. PONDER
COL. DONNA M. PRIGMORE
COL. ROBERT D. REYNER
COL. JAMES A. ROBERTS
COL. RAYMOND S. ROBINSON IV
COL. JAMES P. RYAN
COL. DARRIN E. SLATEN
COL. CHRISTOPHER L. SMITH
COL. JEFFREY S. SMITH
COL. JUSTIN B. SMITH
COL. MARK A. WEBER
COL. JEFFREY L. WILKINSON
COL. JOHN P. YORK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTOPHER R. ALDERDICE
COL. ROBERT S. GRANT
COL. PAUL N. LOISELLE
COL. WAYNE M. MCCAUGHEY
COL. DAVID J. MOUNKES

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ERIC J. WESLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THEODORE D. MARTIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. SUSIE S. KUILAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LESLIE C. SMITH

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. MATTHEW J. KOHLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHNNY R. WOLFE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN C. RING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) SCOTT D. CONN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY L. ADAMS
COL. MARK A. HASHIMOTO
COL. KARL D. PIERSON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JIN HWA LEE FRAZIER
STEVEN J. GROCKI
CURTIS S. KATES
SANDRA M. KENT
ANDREW T. KROG
TYLER E. MERKEL
REBECCA C. SALISBURY
JACK DAVID SPENCER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

COREY L. ANDERSON
STEPHEN C. AUSBAND
BRADLEY G. BUTLER
SHANNON D. FABER
ISAAC J. FAIBISOFF
BRIAN V. FAVERO
IFEOMA S. IZUCHUKWU
ROBYN T. KRAMER
JERRY A. POWELL, JR.
JENNIFER R. RATCLIFF
CHRISTOPHER R. SPINELLI
ROBERT K. TALTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL C. MAINE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MELISSA A. DAY
GWYN MARY PARRISATWELL
DAVID J. SCHIEBER
ROBERTA J. STEMEM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MATTHEW M. BIRD
GREGORY GAITERS
SCOTT D. HANING
CALEB J. KING
DAWNLEE J. ROBERSON
BRYAN T. RUSSELL
DOUGLAS T. SIMONS
PAUL KELLEY STROUD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

HOLLY L. BREWER
ARI JAY FISHER
JULIE C. SMITH
MARIO TOMMASI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN G. ANDRADE
CARL R. ARMOUR
JASON E. BAKER
BRIAN T. BALDWIN
LANCE EDGAR BAXTER
GREGORY B. BERRY
BRIAN DAVID BIGGS
ERIK G. BRINE
GREGORY D. BUCHANAN
GREGORY K. BULES
THOMAS S. BUTLER
BRUCE A. CARPER
KARYN L. CHRISTEN
JOANNA L. COLLINS
GERALD M. COOK
BRIAN R. CUSSON
PAUL R. DELANO, JR.
CHERYL M. DELOUGHERY
MICHAEL A. DESANTIS
CHARLES L. DESTEFANI
JAMES B. DICKEY
SHERARD C. DORROH
BRANDON M. DOUGLASS
KAREN MARIE DOWNES
ALLEN E. DUCKWORTH
WENDI T. DUFFY
JUSTIN H. DUNCAN
DANIEL J. EBRECHT
CHARLES H. EMBS
THOMASMORE J. EPISCOPIO
MARK J. ESTLUND
BRIAN E. FERGUSON
DION R. FLYNN
ANTHONY J. FRANKS
DEANNA K. FRANKS
MATTHEW M. FRITZ
ROBERTO GARCIA
COURTNEY A. HAMILTON
LARA A. HAUGHT
CHRISTOPHER G. HAWN
CAROLYN K. HEPP
BRIAN DAVID HOLLIS
TRINA RENEE HOOD
KENNETH M. JAMBOR
DOUGLAS C. JANKOVICH
ROBERT B. JAYME
SCOTT W. JONES
LEO J. KAMPHAUS, JR.
FRANK R. KINCAID
GREGORY M. KUZMA
CHRISTOPHER K. LACOUTURE
RYAN J. LANDMANN
MICHAEL D. LEONAS
DAVID C. LIONBERGER IV
DANIEL A. LOVING
PHILLIP D. LUTS
MICHAEL S. MALONEY
MARILYN G. MANIFOLD
VALERIE M. MANNING
JOSEPH T. MARCINEK
JAMES JOSEPH MATTEY
MICHAEL S. MAY
MAUREEN HELEN MCALLEN
DWIGHT D. MEESE
CHARLES J. METZGAR
ADAM J. MEYERS
JAY D. MILLER
JENNIFER L. MULDER
JANEL MARIE NELSON
ANNE BREDTHAUER NOEL
TARA E. NOLAN
ISAAC S. OH
BRIAN D. OSWALT
RACHEL R. OUELLETTE
BRETT R. PAOLA
SCOTT D. PETERSON
CURTIS L. PITTS
CHARLES VINCENT PRATT
STEVEN C. PRIEST
JEFFREY M. PRINDLE
KEVIN L. RAINEY
SEAN M. RASSAS
CHRISTOPHER T. RECKER
WAYLON S. RICHARDS
TODD D. RIDDLE
JOHN F. ROBINSON
RICHARD C. ROPAC
TRAVIS M. ROWLEY
CHRISTOPHER E. SEDLACEK
DAVID E. SHAHADY
DONALD C. SIEGMUND
KAREN A. SLOCUM
XAVIERA SLOCUM
JAY MICHAEL SMELTZER
JASON L. SMITH
STEPHEN D. SMITH, JR.
ELTRESSA D. SPENCER
MICHAEL D. STAPLETON
SHARON A. STEHLIK
KANDACE M. STEINBRINK
REX H. STEVES
BRYAN A. STONE
DANIEL D. STOUT
GARRETT C. STUMB
KRISTOFER S. TERRY
PATRICIA THOMAS
ROBERT TAYLOR THOMPSON
THOMAS J. THOMSEN
WILLIAM SCOTT TILLMAN
PETER A. TORTORICI, JR.
STERLING E. TREE
JOHN D. UPTHEGROVE
MARK D. VAN BRUNT
WILLIAM B. VAUGHN
BRENT E. WEISNER
TIMOTHY M. WELTER
SHAWN P. WERCHAN
CHRISTOPHER DAVID WITTER
LAWRENCE P. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOSHUA M. KOVICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAVID M. DERSCH, JR.
WILLIAM L. HOGGATT
ANDREW C. PAK
PATRICK J. TRAVERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LANCE J. KIM
JONATHAN D. KING
MATHEW J. ROYAL
DEREK V. SCHOP
SONIA W. S. TAOYI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAVID L. WELLS II

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOCELYN A. LEVENTHAL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ALYSSA S. ADAMS
JUDITH K. BOYD
JUNG W. CHOI
JOHN M. COOPER
JOSEPH A. FEDORKO
ERIC J. FEUSTEL
TIMOTHY D. HAMILTON
DAVID B. HODGKINSON
ELIZABETH A. JAENICKE
KEVIN C. KAKAC
MYRNA A. MESA
BLAKE E. STONE
RICHARD A. SUGARMAN
BRADLEY O. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KENNETH S. KATROSH
DOLLY R. LIVINGSTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JOSEPH KLOIBER
PAUL NAVAS III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ERICK C. CREWS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MICHAEL C. BRADWICK
DAVID A. GROVES
DOUGLAS S. YOON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ZACHARY T. BUSENBARK
ELLIOT S. GRANT
RUSSELL A. MOORE
DAVID A. SAMBRONEDARKINS
JAIME A. SANJUAN RUBIO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be major

GABBY V. CANCERAN
JOHN P. CROSS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

ADAM T. SOTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 4336(A):

To be colonel

PHILIP J. DACUNTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LYLE A. OURADA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

SHERRY M. KWON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JASON A. PARISH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

HISHAM K. SEMAAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 5582:

To be lieutenant commander

PAUL I. AHN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

ALLEN G. GUNN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

WILLIAM DOCTOR, JR.
LINA M. DOWNING
WILLIAM M. SCHRADER
SCOTT E. VASQUEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JUSTIN J. ANDERSON
JUSTIN J. ANSEL, JR.
THOMAS A. ATKINSON
ANTHONY J. BANGO
DAVID M. BANNING
JOHN C. BARRY
SHAWN B. BELTRAN
GARRETT L. BENSON
CHRISTOPHER J. BRONZI
JASON P. BROWN
SHAWN J. BUDD
WALTER J. BUTLER, JR.
SCOTT E. COBB
DANIEL H. COLEMAN
COREY M. COLLIER
JAMES B. CONWAY
BRIAN P. COYNE
JOHN Y. DELATEUR
KEVIN L. DIGMAN
FRANK DIORIO, JR.
WILLIAM P. DONNELLY III
ERIC J. DOUGHERTY
BRIAN S. DRYZGA
AMY R. EBITZ
JUSTIN W. EGGSTAFF
JOSEPH A. FARLEY
MICHAEL J. FITZGERALD
TRAVIS T. GAINES
JEREMY L. GETTINGS
STEVE E. GILLETTE
MATTHEW T. GOOD
EDWARD C. GREELEY
ROBERT J. GUICE
ERIC J. HAMSTRA
GABRIELLE M. HERMES
CHRISTOPHER L. HOLLOWAY
ROBERT A. HUBBARD
BENJAMIN K. HUTCHINS
RICHARD D. JOYCE
JEFFREY R. KENNEY
BRIAN T. KOCH
SCOTT M. KOLTICK
KEVIN R. KORPINEN
DEREK E. LANE
LUIS F. LARA
VINCENT G. LARATTA
JOHN G. LEHANE
FREDERICK L. LEWIS, JR.
DEVIN O. LICKLIDER
MICHAEL J. LIVINGSTON
BRADLEY M. MAGRATH
TODD M. MANYX
DONALD G. MARASKA
KRISTIN L. MCCANN
JOHN L. MEDEIROS, JR.
PAUL C. MERIDA
THOMAS B. MERRITT, JR.
CHRISTOPHER V. MEYERS
MARK W. MICKE
BRIAN W. MULLERY
CHRISTOPHER P. OCONNOR
ROSS A. PARRISH
TEAGUE A. PASTEL
TERRY M. PAUSTENBAUGH
ROBERT A. PETERSEN
FORD C. PHILLIPS
TIMOTHY R. POWLEDGE
STEVEN D. PUCKETT
OMAR J. RANDALL
MARK R. REID
BRIAN T. RIDEOUT
BENJAMIN S. RINGVELSKI
WILFRED RIVERA
MICHAEL J. ROACH
LEE M. RUSH
BRIAN E. RUSSELL
DENNIS W. SAMPSON, JR.
DENNIS A. SANCHEZ
DOUGLAS C. SANDERS
KURT J. SCHILLER
WILLIAM F. SCHOEN, JR.
SAMUEL C. SCHOOLFIELD
DEAN A. SCHULZ
MICHAEL P. SHAND
BRIAN P. SHARP
MATTHEW R. SIMMONS
PATRICK E. SIMON
TRES C. SMITH
MICHAEL W. STEHLE
ROBERT A. SUCHER
BYRON D. SULLIVAN
ERIC N. THOMPSON
BRADFORD W. TIPPETT
CHARLES R. VONBERGEN
KIPP A. WAHLGREN
ROBERT S. WEILER
SIDNEY R. WELCH
WILLIAM T. WILBURN, JR.
ERIC W. YOUNG
ROBERT C. ZYLA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ARMANDO ACOSTA, JR.
DION A. ANGLIN
WAYNE A. BODINE
WILLIAM M. BOWERS
ADAM W. BRYSON
MARK J. CAMPBELL
PHILLIP E. CONSTANTIN, JR.
JASON B. CORCORAN
JOHN D. CORDONE
CORY M. CUNNINGHAM
JENNIFER M. DOLAN
CHARLES R. DONNELLY, JR.
DAWN N. ELLIS
MICHAEL L. FERRELL
SAMUEL C. GAZZO
JAMES R. HAIDERER
JAMES A. HANLEY II
ROBERT P. HEFFNER, JR.
NATHAN C. HENDERSON
GORDON L. HILBUN
GLEN R. HINES, JR.
STEWART M. JOHNSTON
EDWARD KERN
DANIEL R. KREIDER
BRENT E. LILLY
GARTH P. MASSEY
SCOTT W. MAYFIELD
JON C. MCDANIEL
ROSS A. MEGLATHERY
CHARLES A. MIRACLE
ANDREW W. RALSTON
JULIAN J. RIVERA
DEBRA SIMPSON
AARON J. SMITH
PATRICK F. TIERNAN
BRETT M. WILSON
LANCE A. WINDEL
DAVID K. WINNACKER
THEODORE L. WONG
ROGER M. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

PAULO T. ALVES
PATRICK J. TOAL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

THESOLINA D. HUBERT
TIMOTHY W. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

HENRY W. SOUKUP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM W. INNS III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

LONNIE M. MCGHEE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES B. THOMPSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CRAIG A. ELLIOTT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BILL W. BROOKS, JR.
MICHAEL W. COSTA
KYLE L. HOLLIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

EDWARD J. ABMA
PATRICK C. ACOX
THOMAS A. ADAMS
JOEL G. ADOLPHSON
MILAD AFKHAMI
JULIE E. AHO
ETHAN R. AKERBERG
ADESINA O. ALADETOHUN
CHRISTOPHER J. ALFARO
DAVID P. ALGER
NILS P. ALPERS
MATTHEW J. ALTOMARI
RYAN E. ALVIS
ANTHONY J. AMBRIZ
ELIZABETH AMEZCUA
JASON D. AMUNDSON
SCOTT A. ANDERSEN
CLAYTON T. ANDERSON
MICHAEL D. ANDERSON
RYAN C. ANNESS
KRYSTA N. ANTHONY
TYLER J. ANTHONY
CARL T. ANTOINE
ROSS H. ARMSTRONG
JAMIE L. ASH
LOGAN P. ASH
SHANNON R. ASHLEY
NICHOLAS ASTACIO
JAMES P. AYULE, JR.
DANIEL A. BAIK
CHAD R. BAINBRIDGE
AARON M. BAKER
BENJAMIN B. BAKER
JOHN D. BAKER, JR.
BRIAN T. BALDWIN
MATTHEW T. BARNES
MICHAEL T. BARNUM
WILLIAM E. BARR
PHILIP A. BART
BRIAN J. BASILE
LOUIS T. BATSON V
GARY S. BAXTER
DANIEL G. BECK
ANDREW V. BEHRENDS
CARL P. BEIERL
COLLIN B. BELL
COREY R. BELTON
ROBERT J. BENDA III
JOSHUA C. BENSON
VINCENT J. BERARDINO
TIMOTHY S. BERGER
REBECCA K. BERGSTEDT
EVAN D. BERNSTEIN
ADAM E. BEST
BRENT C. BIRCHUM
LANIER A. BISHOP III
RICARDO R. BITANGA
JOHN D. BLACK
MARC J. BLAIR
STEPHEN M. BLANCHETTE
MARY E. BLOOM
MELISSA G. BLYLEVEN
MARK W. BOCK, JR.
WILLIAM K. BOGNER
DANIEL J. BONO
JOSEPH H. BORGARDT
COLTON G. BOWSER
NICHOLAS A. BOXEY
BOBBY J. BRADFORD
BUCK A. BRADLEY
JOHN G. BRADLEY
KRAEGEN J. BRAMER
RANDY K. BRAZILE
DAVID M. BRENNAN
MICHAEL D. BRESLIN
CHRISTOPHER M. BROMLEY
CHARLES E. BROUN
BENJAMIN J. BROUSSARD
WILLIAM D. BROWN
MITCH A. BRUCE
STAFFORD A. BUCHANAN
BENJAMIN J. BULLOCK
JESSE A. BURDICK
BRIAN L. BURGER
LUCAS J. BURKE
CATHERINE J. BURNS
DANIEL F. BURNS
JONATHAN B. BUSH
JOHN J. BUSS
BENJAMIN G. BUTLER
DALLAS T. BUTLER
NICHOLAS R. BUTNER
CHARLES T. BYERS, JR.
CHRISTOPHER W. CAIN
DAVID M. CAIN
CODY M. CALHOUN
AUDREY F. CALLANAN
JOHN J. CAMPBELL
SEAN C. CAMPBELL
MARCO A. CAMPOS
JOSHUA C. CANATSEY
KELLY M. CANDIES
RYAN F. CAPDEPON
JAMES M. CAPPABIANCA
JEFFREY F. CARBEN
EDGARDO B. CARDONA
SEAMUS B. CAREY
MARCUS J. CARLSTROM
JUSTIN M. CARRASCO
LINDSEY M. CARROLL
BRIANA L. CARTER
MATTHEW E. CARWILE
CHRISTOPHER K. CASTAGNETTI
ZACHARY J. CESARZ
BRIAN M. CHAMBERLAIN
KALEY S. CHAN
JOSEPH M. CHAPPELL
KEENAN J. CHIRHART
DANIEL S. CHIRIBOGA
BRIAN K. CHONG
ERIC J. CHUNG
RUSSELL H. CLARKE
MELANIE N. CLIFTON
HENRY A. COBB
JORDAN R. COCHRAN
JONATHAN M. COHEN
WILLIAM M. COLEMAN
JOHN T. COLLINS
DOUGLAS A. COLUMBUS
JAMES P. CONNOLLY
DANIEL D. CONTI
KATIE A. COOK
SCOTT W. COOK
ROBERT A. COPLEN
CHRISTOPHER R. CORBEILLE
SETH C. CORMIER
NARCISO CORRAL, JR.
ISAAC CORTES
MIGUEL A. CORTEZ
JORGE C. COUTO
DANIEL B. COWDEN
JOSHUA S. COX
LUCAS A. CRIDER
JOHN W. CRITZ
ROY B. CROCKETT
VICTORIA M. CROWDER
KYLEIGH M. CULLEN
CHRISTOPHER S. CZEPIEL
CHRISTOPHER J. CZUMAK
GREGORY R. CZYZEWSKI
LANE A. DAIGLE
MATTHEW E. DALTON
DUONG X. DAM
WILLIAM F. DAMMIN
JASON M. DASILVA
MATTHEW C. DAUGHERTY
MATTHEW H. DAVIDHIZAR
LOGAN M. DAVIS
MARCUS R. DAVIS
RON O. DAVIS
RUSSELL J. DAWSON
DIRK A. DAZA
WILLIAM R. DEFRANCIS
DANIEL DELARA
BRETT A. DEMARIA
TRAVIS G. DENNY
CODY W. DENTON
JOEL L. DETRICK
CHRISTOPHER D. DEVRIES
JASON F. DEWALD
JAROD W. DICKS
STEPHEN A. DIGIROLAMO
MATTHEW J. DILLON
MATTHEW M. DISTEFANO
ANDREW P. DO
ANDREW N. DOBSON
TAYLOR T. DODD
WILLIAM H. DODSON
MICHEAL A. DORSEY
WILLIAM J. DUBOIS
DEAN R. DUKES
JACOB S. DUNN
SEAN M. ECKERT
MARK S. EDGAR
STEPHEN V. EGERDAHL
THEODORE T. EHLERT
TIMOTHY D. EHRHARD
EDUARDO ELIZONDO
MEGAN L. ELLIOTT
ALEXIS R. ELLIS
BRENT A. EMERY
DAVID R. EMISON II
JAMES G. ENGLEHART
JOHN R. EPPES
ROBERT J. EPSTEIN
ANDREW C. ERICSON
SLADE B. ERMIS
DANIEL E. ERTEL
ANTHONY O. ESPINOZA
PATRICK S. ESTVOLD
MARK D. EVANS
ANDREW H. EVERITT
EVAN J. FAIRFIELD
BRIAN A. FELTY
DAVID P. FEMEA
PHILLIP D. FERNANDEZ
CAITLIN T. FERRARELL
DANIEL P. FIRESTONE
KARL E. FISHER
ALEXANDRA C. FITZGERALD
DANIEL P. FITZGERALD
MARK T. FITZGERALD
KEVIN J. FITZSIMMONS
ERIC D. FLANAGAN
KEVIN N. FLIPPIN
MICHAEL S. FLURRY
JEREMY M. FORRER
MATTHEW S. FORSHEE
WILLIAM J. FORTIN
DAVID M. FOTI
JOHN M. FOUT
BOBBY T. FOWLER
CALEB L. FRANZOY
JOSHUA C. FREELAND
GREGORY A. FREVERT
THOMAS A. FREY
JUSTIN A. FRICKIE
BRADLEY C. FROMM
SCOTT A. FURLONG
ERIC M. GALLOWAY
MARCIAL J. GARCIA
BENJAMIN E. GARDNER
JOHN G. GARLASCO, JR.
RAUL P. GARZA
TODD J. GASTON
JARED R. GASTROCK
JUSTIN M. GATES
JONATHAN S. GAYMAN
BRIAN T. GEISEN
TRAVIS P. GELETZKE
ANDOM T. GHEREZGHIHER
MARK A. GILBERT
JENS A. GILBERTSON
MATTHEW F. GLISSON
BRENT P. GODDARD II
ROBERT E. GOLIKE
LEAH M. GONNELLA
FOUA C. GONZALES
EDUARDO A. GONZALEZ
JOSE GONZALEZ
DAVID A. GOODMAN
DAVID E. GOODRICH
BRIAN A. GOSS
TROY D. GOSS
DANIEL S. GREEN
LAWRENCE D. GREENE
BRIAN D. GRIFFITH
CRAIG D. GRINDLE
ROSS F. GRUNENWALD
BRIAN C. GRYGO
ROBERT W. GRZELAK
ANTHONY M. GRZINCIC
GEOFFREY J. GUTIERREZ
BRIAN D. HALL
ELIZABETH M. HALL
KRISTINE S. HALL
SHAUN I. HALL
THOMAS C. HAMBIDGE
RYAN L. HAMILTON
DANNY A. HAMLER
JERROD C. HAMMES
CHRISTOPHER B. HAMPTON
KEVIN R. HANRATTY
CODY L. HARDENBURGH
JOSEPH W. HARDIN
MARIA L. HARLEY
ERINN T. HARP
ROBERT G. HATCHLEY, JR.
BILLY J. HAYES
HUNTER S. HAYES
WILLIAM M. HAYNES
SAMUEL T. HEATH
ELEUTERIO R. HECHANOVA
BRIAN E. HEETER
BENJAMIN T. HELD
WILLIAM A. HEMME
JOSHUA D. HERM
TERRY J. HERZOG, JR.
BRENDAN P. HEWETT
JASON B. HIBLER
TIMOTHY M. HICHAK
SEAN C. HICKS
ERIK W. HICKSON
GRAHAM D. HILL
RUSSELL A. HILL
JARED D. HIMES
BRIAN A. HINRICHS
JOHN P. HINTON
BENJAMIN S. HIPKINS
YUWYNN E. HO
LEVI A. HOFTS
PATRICK S. HOLCOMB
JAMES B. HOLDERBAUM
MICHAEL G. HOLMBERG
JAMES M. HOLT, JR.
NICOLE P. HOLT
TIMOTHY J. HOOTEN
SARAH K. HORN
BENJAMIN C. HOUGH
NATHAN E. HOULE
DANIEL R. HOUSINGER
JARED B. HOWELLS
WILLIAM J. HUNTER
SARAH M. HUTCHINSON
RICHARD A. IAFELICE
RYAN T. IDEN
TIMOTHY R. IRISH
JUSTIN Y. ITO
JUAN J. ITURRIAGA
JAMES M. JACKSON
MAKOTO C. JACOBS
ALEX P. JAMES
DAVID A. JANECKE
ROBERT J. JANKOWSKI
CLAYTON C. JAROLIMEK
NATHAN L. JEFFCOAT
STEPHENSON S. JOHN
GARRETT D. JOHNSON
JOSHUA J. JOHNSON
JOSHUA R. JOHNSON

ROBERT L. JOHNSON III
BRADLEY A. JONES
JOHN D. JONES
KEVIN P. JONES
KIMBERLY J. JONES
MARGARET A. JONES
NEAL T. JONES
CORY C. JURE
KAREN E. KALLAUR
KYLE B. KANODE
CHRISTOPHER P. KARLE
ERIC M. KASKELA
JESSICA M. KASTER
JOEL M. KATZ
EDWARD W. KAY III
GLEN M. KELSO, JR.
MATTHEW S. KENDRICK
STEPHEN D. KENT
EUSTRATIOS N. KERAMIDAS
BRIAN D. KERREBROCK
THUONG H. KIEU
BRIAN C. KIMMINS
RYAN R. KINDER
GREGORY J. KIRSCH
WILLIAM H. KLOTH
HAROLD A. KNUPP, JR.
MARK W. KOCIBA
ERIC B. KOSELAK
MATTHEW J. KRAYEWSKY
ANDREW C. KREBS
MATTHEW A. KREMPEL
JOLANTA O. KREMPIN
JOHN J. KRESS
MATTHEW M. KRIVOHLAVY
MATTHEW J. KRUGGEL
BRYANT J. KRUSE
DAVID M. KUCIRKA
CHARLES A. KUHNMUENCH IV
BRIAN J. KUJAWSKI
JUSTIN K. KUNERT
KARL T. KURBIKOFF
JAMES M. LAFLEUR
NATALIE M. LAMB
PAUL J. LANCASTER III
JACK R. LARIMORE III
BRIAN M. LARSON
LYNN M. LARSON
JEREMY D. LAUX
BRIDGER LEARY
BENJAMIN C. LEATHERBURY
BENJAMIN R. LENOX
IAN M. LEONARD
JOHN J. LEONE III
EDWARD J. LESLIE
ANDREW M. LEWIS
JOSHUA M. LEWIS
JUSTIN A. LEWIS
TOBIN J. LEWIS
ALEX H. LIM
ADAM V. LINK
RYAN C. LIPTON
JEFFREY E. LITTLE
DWAYNE M. LITTLEJOHN
ROBERT K. LIVENGOOD
KRISTOFFER P. LJUNGGREN
SHAUN R. LOCKLEAR
BRENT E. LOGAN
JAMES W. LONG
SHAWN R. LOUGHMAN
DANIEL C. LOVE
KEVIN M. LOWE
GREGORY Z. LUCAS
THOMAS D. LUCEY
JOSEPH W. LUKEFAHR
LYNELLE S. LUND
ROBERT J. LUNDGREN
ADRIAN R. LYONS
JAMES S. MACKIN
JENNIFER V. MACKOWIAK
MICHAEL P. MADIA
STEPHEN M. MAGEE
JOHN R. MAGILL
WILLIAM A. MAHONEY
WILLIAM J. MAJESKI IV
DANIEL M. MAJTAN
ROBERT E. MALCOLM
MATTHEW J. MALINOWSKI
ANDREW R. MANAOIS
BRUCE A. MANUEL, JR.
VINCE S. MARGIOTTA
NICOLE D. MARINELLI
STEPHEN R. MARO
CHRISTOPHER D. MARSH
ERIC E. MARSHMAN
ANDREW J. MARTIN
FRANK J. MASTROMAURO
MARIN MATIJEVIC
ERIC J. MATTISON
ANDREW G. MAXWELL
SEAN T. MCCARRAGHER
ERIC M. MCCUSKER
PATRICK B. MCDONALD
JOHN D. MCDOW
GRANT W. MCDOWELL
PATRICK A. MCELROY
GREGORY W. MCGOUGH
JESSE R. MCGOUGH
KYLE J. MCHUGH
VANESSA M. MCKEE
JEREMY D. MCLEAN
KEVIN W. MCMULLEN, JR.
DANIEL S. MCNEAR
TIMOTHY J. MCPEAK
CHRISTOPHER A. MEADOWS
KYLE D. MEEDER
JOSEPH S. MEISEL
JASON MERTILUS
KYLE T. MEYER
DAVID J. MILLER
JACOB B. MILLER
NATHANIEL G. MILLER
SETH C. MILLER
MERRITT T. MITCHELL
CHARLES M. MOHLER
BRADLEY J. MOHR
FREDERICK D. MONDAY
JEFFREY C. MONROE
CHRISTOPHER G. MONTGOMERY
DALHIA G. MONTGOMERY
SAMUEL E. MOORE
SEAN E. MOORE
ALEXANDER MORA
TAYLOR S. MORAWSKI
ROBERT D. MORGAN
STEVEN L. MORRIS, JR.
WILLIAM C. MORRISON
MATTHEW M. MORSE
GREGORY T. MOYNIHAN
JOHN J. MUELLER
MOLLY A. MULDOON
JOSHUA W. MUNSEE
LUIS E. MURILLO, JR.
JOSEPH P. MURPHY
DAVID R. MURRAY
THOMAS F. NEWCOMB
ERIN B. NEWPORT
KEVIN C. NICHOLSON
MICHAEL A. NIEMAN
TIMOTHY C. NOLAN
JASON N. NOLL
JUSTIN M. NOONE
MICHAEL A. NORDIN
ROSS L. NORMAN
STEVEN G. NORRIS
DAVID K. NOVAK
DUSTIN M. OAKES
JEREMY A. OBERDOVE
CASEY M. ODOHERTY
BENJAMIN J. ODONNELL
MARK R. ODRISCOLL
FELEMAY A. OGBASION
KATHLEEN J. OHARA
TAKASHI OKAMOTO
KWABENA O. OKYEREBOATENG
CHARLES C. OLSON
YULIYA OMAROV
JORGE A. ORNELAS
SEAN R. OROURKE
KEVIN B. OSBORNE
JAMES T. OSHAUGHNESSY
JOSEPH A. PACENTRILLI
ZACHARY J. PAGAN
BRADLEY C. PALM
JEFFREY P. PARDEE
ANTHONY A. PARKER
DAVID J. PARKER
LAWRENCE T. PARKER, JR.
MATTHEW D. PARSONS
JONATHAN A. PATRAS
JOSEF E. PATTERSON
ANDREW E. PAUL
JAMESON S. PAYNE
EDWIN S. PAZ
MARIELA PENA
WILLIAM T. PENDERGAST
MICAH J. PENN
JARED L. PERRY
MATTHEW T. PERRY
BRADLEY M. PETERSEN
TEAL A. PETERSON
JUSTIN D. PETTY
TYVON J. PETWAY
CHRISTOPHER M. PHIFER
CHAD J. PIMLEY
SHAWN J. PINER
PATRICK J. PORT
NICHOLAS J. POTOSKY
CHARLES A. POULTON
JUSTIN J. POUST
WOLF J. POWELL
CHAD R. PRESLEY
GREGORY B. PROCACCINI
JAMES P. PSYHOGIS
DANIEL B. PURSEL
JOHN D. QUAIL
STEPHAN J. QUIRK
BRIAN A. RADLER
ANDREW W. RAICH
SEAN G. RAMIREZ
JEFFREY D. RANDALL
ELIOT V. RASMUSSEN
JOEL N. REA
BENJAMIN C. READING
MATTHEW R. RECKER
CHRISTOPHER A. REITHMANN
NORMAN L. RENFRO
VICTOR H. RESILLAS
ERIC C. REW
TIMOTHY J. REYNOLDS
ERIK D. RHEINHART
JONATHON L. RICHARDS
SCOTT A. RICHARDS
THOMAS A. RIGBY
WILLIAM L. RIORDON
EDDIE R. RIVERA
DELL L. ROBINSON
ERNEST C. ROBINSON
LARS N. ROCKHOLM
SHON C. ROEGGE
STEVEN P. ROGERS
DAVID M. ROOKS
JOHN S. ROSE
ANNAELIZAB M. RUBIOFLEISCHER
JOHNATHAN J. RUDY
JOSEPH M. RUSSELL
MATTHEW R. RUSSELL
RYAN J. RUSSELL
ERIK C. RYE
DANE C. SAGERHOLM
BRANDON A. SALTER
VIC E. SANCEDA
DEREK C. SANDERS
SCOTT B. SANDERS
GEOFFREY L. SANFORD
PAUL W. SANFORD
VINCENT E. SAPEDA II
THOMAS J. SCANLAN
RYAN T. SCHEETZ
ERIC A. SCHEIBE
DUSTIN R. SCHELEGLE
BROCK H. SCHELLER
PATRICK C. SCHERER
BRADLEY J. SCHMIDT
JEREMY W. SCHNARR
PATRICK A. SCHRAFFT
DANIEL J. SCHREINER
ANDREW P. SCHROERS
THOMAS K. SCHUEMAN
CARLY E. SCHWARZENBERG
CHRISTOPHER L. SCZEPANIK
ADRIENNE C. SERBAROLI
JACOB L. SHANTON
KYLE P. SHEA
JASON C. SHEVOKAS
JONATHAN SHIH
DEREK L. SHIVERS
THOMAS A. SHORT
BENJAMIN J. SIEGEL
RICHARD M. SIERRA
DAVID R. SIMON
MICHAEL J. SIMPSON
RODERICK J. SINGLETON, JR.
ZERBIN M. SINGLETON
SHARON A. SISBARRO
MICHAEL J. SKALICKY
JOHN P. SKOGMAN
NICHOLAS M. SMART
ALEXANDER G. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER M. SMITH
CLARK K. SMITH
GEOFFREY A. SMITH
JACOB S. SMITH
JAMES S. SMITH
JUSTIN E. SMITH
ALLISON N. SMYCZYNSKI
SCOTT L. SNYDER
KIMBERLY J. SONNTAG
JOSHUA R. SOUTHERLAND
WILLIAM W. SOUTHWARD III
STEVEN M. SPRIGG
DERICK E. STAFFENSON
GEORGE B. STAMPS
DONALD J. STANFORD
JAMES C. STANLEY
WILLIS R. STATON
BENJAMIN K. STEELE
SHAWN C. STELZEL
DIMITRI STEPANOFF
SEAN M. STEPHENSON
LOUIS V. STRAMAGLIA, JR.
JARED W. STREETER
RYAN T. STREHL
BRIAN J. STROM
JOHN P. STUART
GENEVIEVE M. STUDER
JASON L. SULLIVAN
MILES J. SULLIVAN
SEAN B. SULLIVAN
FRANK W. SWAN, JR.
ROBERT S. SWARTZ
SPENCER D. SWEET
JOSEPH C. SWINDELL
HEIDI C. SYKAS
JOHN W. SYKAS III
MITCHELL W. SYMES
DANIEL M. TADROSS
RAYMOND N. TAKOR
ERIK J. TARABA
BRIAN E. TAYLOR
JOSEPH E. TAYLOR
SEAN R. TAYLOR
VINCENT J. TEIXEIRA
LINK T. TERRY
MICHAEL J. THOMAS
SHAUN E. THOMAS
NICHOLAS M. THOMPSON
VINCENT L. THOMPSON
KEITH I. TOUCEY III
MICHAEL A. TOZZOLO IV
DAVID J. TRAIL
BRADEN T. TRAINOR
KEITH E. TROJNIAK
CHRISTOPHER A. TUCKER
MATTHEW I. TWEED
CHRISTOPHER M. ULCAK
STEVEN J. UZIEL
RONALD E. VALASEK, JR.
STEVEN A. VALENTI
MITCHELL J. VANDERKODDE
GREGORY S. VARELLA
RICHARD A. VAYNSHTEYN
OCIE C. VEST
GREGORY M. VETETO
JEFFREY D. VICKERS
SHANE J. VIGIL
JAMISON T. VINCENT
KURT M. VOGLER
JOSHUA C. WADDELL
JONATHAN R. WALASKI
JOSHUA J. WALL
JONATHAN B. WALLACE

ROBERT K. WALLACE
CRAIG M. WARNER
STEVEN M. WARNER
TIMOTHY O. WARREN, JR.
WILLIAM G. WATHEN
TAMARA D. WATKINS
JASON M. WEAVER
DANIEL E. WEBBER
NICHOLAS D. WEBSTER
MICHAEL A. WEHNER
SHAWN C. WEHRLE
ROBERT A. WELLS
WALTER M. WEST
CHAD N. WETHERALD
JEREMY A. WHEELER
CHRISTOPHER P. WHELAN
SCOTT A. WHIPPLE
THOMAS K. WHITESEL
ALLEN R. WHITLOW
CHRISTOPHER S. WHITSON
JACOB E. WIDRICK
COREY J. WIELERT
DUSTIN L. WILCOX
DANIEL R. WILHELM
JACK B. WILLIAMS
JEREMY R. WILLIAMS
RYAN E. WILLIAMS
TAYLOR F. WILLIAMS
WAYNE P. WILLIAMS
ERIC J. WILMOTT
KYLE T. WILSON
WILLUS B. WITHROW
CAMERON P. WOLF
CHRISTOPHER J. WOOD
MATTHEW L. WOOD
TINA J. WOODRUFF
JAMES W. WOODS
ALEX D. WOODWARD
MICHAEL D. WRIGHT
TYLER C. WRIGHT
ANDREW A. YAGER
AUSTIN T. YAGLE
KYLE D. YAKOPOVICH
VLADIMIR Y. YARNYKH
HYUNHAK YIM
ANGELA D. YOUMANS
VINCENT V. YOUNG
JACOB M. ZABOROWSKI
JONATHAN J. ZAINEA
GEORGE R. ZEIGLER
DIANNA R. ZEMPEL
GREGORY T. ZERR
JOSEPH A. ZIMMERMANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JUSTIN R. ANDERSON
JOHN ANTHENOR
MICHAEL E. BELL
LEE A. BOYCE
DANIEL A. BRENES
KARL A. BRONK
THOMAS B. CARSON
MICHAEL S. GRINER
ROBERT C. HOFFMAN
ZACHARY B. ISBERNER
PATRICK J. JONES
TREY B. KENNEDY
JOON M. LEE
LUIS E. MARTINEZPEREIRA
IAN C. MCDONALD
DAVID K. MOBERG
ADAM E. MOORE
TIMOTHY M. MOORE
RICHARD PIERRE
EUGENE J. PORTER
JULIA N. WEBER
STEPHEN W. WHITE
MICHAEL D. WILCOX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

STEVEN P. HULSE

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING WHEATON CHRISTIAN GRAMMAR SCHOOL AS A 2017 NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Wheaton Christian Grammar School in Winfield, Illinois on being named a 2017 National Blue Ribbon Award winner. The National Blue Ribbon Award is presented to schools for outstanding academic performance and Wheaton Christian Grammar School is well-deserving of this recognition.

Founded by local parents in 1942, Wheaton Christian Grammar School exists to educate, train, and nurture children for godliness and excellence, equipping them to engage and transform their world for Jesus Christ. Seventy-six years later, the dedication, persistent prayer, and sacrifice of those founding parents is evident in today's school which is widely recognized for its academic rigor, breadth of programming, and spiritual vitality.

In order to unlock the full potential of its student body, Wheaton Christian Grammar School offers a variety of challenging opportunities to suit the interests of nearly every student. From after-school drama clubs, chess teams, spelling bees, community service programs, and athletic activities such as cross-country, soccer, and basketball, students at Wheaton Christian Grammar School participate in life experiences that help shape the character of each student, as well as provide them with an outstanding education.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Wheaton Christian Grammar School on being named a 2017 National Blue Ribbon Award winner.

RECOGNIZING JIM PIRO

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today friends, coworkers, and admirers of Jim Piro gathered to acknowledge his 37 years of service to Portland General Electric and to our community.

For the last eight years Jim has been president and CEO of Oregon's largest public utility. In that role he has worked to help advance that utility's efforts to contribute to Oregon's clean energy standards. During his tenure, PGE worked to strengthen its portfolio of clean energy, and is scheduled to be coal free by 2035. By 2040, half of Oregon's electricity will come from renewables and PGE will play a significant role in that transition. Jim was one of the first business leaders to denounce the Trump Administration's decision to withdraw from the Paris climate accord, stressing the importance of national and international actions on climate, which are becoming more urgent over the last decade. He has provided business and civic leadership that has made a difference in the Portland community and beyond. We wish this proud Benson High School engineer well as he transitions into this next phase.

HONORING MR. EDMOND ''NED'' CULLINAN

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ned Cullinan upon his retirement from the City of Waterbury, Connecticut's Democratic Town Committee. Ned has been a true leader in the Waterbury community for decades, ranging from his work as a builder of common ground within a wonderfully diverse politically active city to his service with a variety of local civic organizations.

A native of Waterbury, Connecticut, Ned took an active role in his community and showed an interest in politics from a young age. He was elected Vice President of his senior class at Sacred Heart High School, and was an avid basketball player. He went on to play at Providence College, where he graduated in 1973.

Through his decades of community work, Ned has had a tremendous impact, not only in Waterbury, but throughout Connecticut. Everyone in the city's political community knows Ned for his tireless work to ensure that all of the diverse voices of the city are heard by public officials. He was first elected to the Waterbury Democratic Town Committee in 1988, and then went on to serve as Second Vice Chairman, and finally as Chairman of the DTC for nearly thirteen years. In this role, Ned worked with local, state, and federal leaders to ensure they were accountable to Waterbury's residents and invested in the community's success.

Ned has also been a leader in a number of civic organizations in the Brass City. He was Director of the Bunker Hill Sports Association for fifteen years, coaching basketball, baseball, and soccer. He has also served as the President of the Holy Cross Father's Club and the Greater Waterbury Olympian Club. Professionally, Ned worked for United Technologies for many years, retiring recently. I wish him an enjoyable retirement with plenty of time to spend with his wonderful wife Anne Marie and his loving family and many friends.

Mr. Speaker, Ned has been an instrumental leader in Waterbury, Connecticut for decades, using his time and talents to advocate for the city and to bring our community together. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor my friend, and a devoted Waterburian and Democrat, Ned Cullinan here today.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF JOHN PAUL FOX

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of John Paul Fox who died on December 18, 2017, at his home in Houston, Mississippi. Mr. Fox served his fellow citizens during a long and exemplary career in the field of law and through public service. He was a man known for his ready smile, quick sense of humor, abundant kindness, extreme generosity, and devotion to family.

Mr. Fox was born on December 31, 1933, in Columbiana, Alabama, where he graduated from Shelby County High School. He was a standout student and athlete. He was a member of the Boy Scouts of America and rose to the rank of Eagle Scout. While in high school, Mr. Fox worked after school and during the summers at a local drug store and for attorney ''Handy'' Ellis. It was his association with Mr. Ellis that inspired him to pursue a career in the field of law.

Mr. Fox received a football scholarship to the University of Alabama. Mr. Fox was also a member of the Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity. He graduated with a business degree in 1956, which his family said was appropriate because he was known for his entrepreneurial spirit. After graduation, Mr. Fox enlisted in the U.S. Army and completed Officer Candidate School (OCS). Later, he worked as an adjuster for USF&G in Birmingham, Alabama. Prior to moving to Mississippi to attend the University of Mississippi School of Law, Mr. Fox met his future wife, Marion Miller. They were married in 1959, while he was a law student. In 1961, Mr. and Mrs. Fox moved to Houston, where he practiced law. Mr. Fox's family said that he embraced practicing law in a small town setting because he liked helping people. He also enjoyed the technical intrigue of law which he continued to practice until one day prior to his death.

Mr. Fox' s military career continued when he enlisted in the Mississippi Army National Guard where he was assigned to the Pontotoc division. It was during his service in the National Guard that he defended James Meredith, the first African American student admitted to the segregated University of Mississippi. Mr. Fox's family said he enjoyed telling stories about that six-week assignment which included digging a fox hole in the law school dean's yard.

While practicing law, Mr. Fox entered public service. He served as Houston City Attorney. Mr. Fox also served as the attorney for the Chickasaw County Board of Supervisors, Chickasaw County Development Foundation, and as legal counsel for the State Jaycee President. He was also active in the Chickasaw Republican. Party and served as their first chairman.

Mr. Fox is survived by his wife of 58 years, Marion Miller Fox; his three children, Elizabeth

Fox Ausbern, Grant Moncrief Fox, and Blakely Fox Fender; his son-in-law, Terry Keith Ausbern; his daughter-in-law, Sara Martin Fox; and son-in-law, Ronald Joseph Fender; his six grandchildren, Allen Gray Crosthwait, Wilkes Edward Crosthwait, John Martin Fox, Luke Rivers Fender, Marion Elizabeth Ausbern, and William Fox Fender.

Mr. Fox lived to serve his fellow man. His leadership was an inspiration to many. I have often said that great leaders do not develop other followers. They develop other leaders. Mr. Fox demonstrated this throughout his life. He will always be remembered for his devotion to our nation, his community, and above all, to his family.

IN MEMORY OF MAYOR JOHN EDGAR BOURNE, JR.

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 2018, South Carolina lost a dedicated statesman with the death of John Edgar Bourne, Jr. In 1971, Bourne was a visionary and led the incorporation of the City of North Charleston, South Carolina. He continued to preside over North Charleston's expansion as Mayor for nearly 20 years, to where today it is the state's third largest city. My mother worked for Senator Bourne in his real estate firm, and I am grateful for his leadership as one of South Carolina's first Republican state senators in the Twentieth Century.

I include in the RECORD the following thoughtful obituary, published in The Post and Courier on January 11, 2018:

John Edgar Bourne, Jr., 90, of North Charleston, SC, died Thursday, January 11, 2018. The family will receive friends Monday January 15, 2018, in the Felix C. Davis Center, Park Circle, North Charleston, SC, from 11:00 am until 2:00 pm where a Service of Remembrance will be held at 2:00 pm. Arrangements by J. Henry Stuhr, Inc., Northwoods Chapel.

John was born December 4, 1927 in Conway, SC, son of the late John Edgar Bourne and the late Mary Thelma Bland Bourne. He was a veteran of the US a retired realtor, a member of Cooper River Baptist Church and the first Mayor of North Charleston. He is survived by two daughters, Mary Bourne (Patrick) Bos and Carol Bourne Toman of North Charleston, SC; three sisters: Irma Gasque, Joan Jordan, Margie Bercume all of Conway, SC; ten grandchildren: Duncan (Mardi) Padgett, Sam (Shannon) Padgett, Alicia (David) Callahan, Troy (Laurie) Bos, Matthew (Amy) Heath, Sarah (Rudy) Estrada, Natalie (Paul) Hernandez, Nick (Kat) Bourne, Katie Bourne, John B. (Marissa) Bourne. He was preceded in death by his wife, Blanche Holt Bourne; son, John E. Bourne III; brothers, Frankie Bourne and Morris Bourne. He leaves behind 17 great-grandchildren. He also says goodbye to his most faithful four legged companion, Buddy, a rescued West Highland Terrier.

In lieu of flowers memorials may be made to American Red Cross Carolina Low Country Chapter, 2424 City Hall Lane Suite #A, Charleston, SC 29406 and/or Charleston Animal Society, 2455 Remount Road, North Charleston, SC 29406. Living plants will be replanted in the parks of North Charleston for all citizens to enjoy.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JERRY VAN DYKE

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize the life of the famed entertainer Jerry Van Dyke.

Jerry is a native of Danville, Illinois where as a young boy he began his life in show business. His first job in the entertainment industry was as an usher at the Fischer Theatre in downtown Danville. Jerry's first stage appearance came in 1947 with Danville's Red Mask Players.

Jerry made his first major guest appearance on his brother's Dick Van Dyke Show. Jerry went on to be a regular on the Judy Garland Show and perform in supporting roles in various films. Jerry caught his big break in the TV series Coach. For his role, he received four Emmy nominations.

Jerry, even with all of his success never lost his love for his home town. Through his career, he made numerous visits to Danville to visit with friends or support his community. In fact, Jerry alongside fellow Danville stars Dick Van Dyke, Donald O'Connor, Bobby Short, and Gene Hackman raised $400,000 for the Fischer Theater. Danville honors Jerry and others local celebrities through a mural that faces the Fischer Theatre.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to send my most heartfelt condolences to Jerry Van Dyke's family and friends. He will be missed dearly by all of those he has touched.

RECOGNIZING THE HONORABLE PAULA STOCKMAN

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a dedicated public servant and trusted leader, Cattaraugus County Legislature Chairman Paula Stockman, who unexpectedly passed away late last week.

Mrs. Stockman had served on the Cattaraugus County legislature since 2010, and became the second woman to hold the chair in 2015. Prior to her tenure on the county legislature, Mrs. Stockman served as village clerk in her home of South Dayton, New York. She also served as co-chairman of the Cattaraugus County Shared Services Initiatives.

Mrs. Stockman played an important role in the county legislature's work to reestablish the Cornell Cooperative Extension of Cattaraugus County. She also worked to ensure the continuation of the 4–H program for more than four-hundred young people.

I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering Mrs. Paula Stockman and her exemplary legacy of service to Cattaraugus County, and in assuring the family and community that she leaves behind that our thoughts and prayers are with them.

IN MEMORY OF MAYOR ROSALYN REEDER

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina is appreciating the patriotic service of Summit Mayor Rosalyn Reeder who passed away Sunday, January 14, 2018. Mayor Reeder was a proud patriot as Mayor and as a U.S. Navy Chief Petty Officer. I will always cherish my pleasant surprise to meet with her and fellow Seabees in Fallujah, Iraq in 2005, where she made such a difference establishing infrastructure for a civil society in Iraq include in the RECORD the following obituary, published in The State on January 17, 2018:

Rosalyn Mary Reeder, 64, passed away Sunday, Jan. 14, 2018 at Warriors Walk, Dorn VA Medical Center, Columbia, SC. A memorial will be held in Rosalyn's honor from 6–8 p.m. on Thursday, Jan. 18, 2018 at Shiloh Methodist Church, 1000 Spring Hill Rd., Gilbert, SC 29054. Rosalyn was born June 12, 1953 in McKeesport, PA to Mary and Larry Reeder. Surviving are her sisters Betty Jo, Cheryl, and brother John, and she was proceeded in death by her sister Loretta. She was a loving Aunt to 12 nieces and nephews. Rosalyn graduated from Midlands Tech and retired from the U.S. Navy as a Chief Petty Officer, serving for 20 years, and completing tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. A driving force, she was the Mayor of Summit, SC accomplishing several community projects and supported a population of over 430 people. Rosalyn was the heart of her family, caring for everyone she met. With her Chihuahua, Izzy, by her side she never hesitated to put others first. In her final years, she resided with her Aunt, Zu Martin, and lived life to the fullest. Her bigger than life personality will forever be missed and never forgotten. Anchors Aweigh!

FCC VICTORVILLE FCI II WARDEN CYNTHIA ENTZEL ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exemplary career of Federal Correctional Complex Victorville FCI II Warden Cynthia Entzel. On January 18, 2018, Warden Entzel will retire after 22 years of service with the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Warden Entzel's career with the Bureau of Prisons began in 1996 when she worked as a time and attendance clerk for FCC Florence. She was then promoted to a secretarial position at FCC Florence and was eventually made a case manager at FCI Englewood. In 2008 she transferred to FCC Victorville as a case manager coordinator before attaining the position of executive assistant at FCC Allenwood. In 2013, Warden Entzel was named associate warden of FCI Schuylkill before transferring to U.S. Medical Center for Federal Prisoners Springfield. She returned to FCC Victorville in 2016 as the warden for FCI II.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate Warden

Entzel for a distinguished career with the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Her dedication and commitment to the profession of law enforcement reflects great credit upon herself and the United States of America.

GLOBAL HEALTH INNOVATION ACT OF 2017

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1660, Global Health Innovation Act, because it encourages the continual research and development of new global health strategies and promotes transparency between our Federal agencies and the United States Congress.

Under H.R. 1660, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) would be required to report to Congress on the development and use of global health innovations in USAID programs, projects, and activities.

This annual report would have to include a thorough description of:

The extent to which global health innovations include drugs, vaccines, and mobile technologies, as well as related service delivery improvements and behavior changes;

How innovation has advanced USAID's efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, end preventable child and maternal deaths, protect communities from infectious diseases, and further its Global Health Strategic Framework;

Progress made toward health product development goals;

How USAID's investments in innovation relate to its goals;

How USAID leverages investments to improve health innovation, develops affordable global health products, and advances health innovations in development;

USAID's collaboration with other federal agencies; and

How USAID is coordinating global health innovation activities between its Global Development Lab, Center for Accelerating Innovation and Impact, and Bureau for Global Health.

The report would have to be submitted within 180 days of the bill's enactment, and then annually for four years.

The critical research and development of global health technologies has facilitated the development of life-saving technologies saving countless lives across the globe.

Ultimately, the goal of H.R. 1660 is to support a long-term program to develop these much needed health technologies and innovative easy-to-use health solutions for low resource environment.

I have always been an advocate for the protection of women and children.

This bill would help to stifle the spread of infectious diseases in underdeveloped countries, and work to find new and improved ways to fight infection for those who cannot fight themselves.

So I stand for H.R. 1660; and I ask my colleagues to stand with me in support of this bill, and the pursuit of improved global health.

THESE IRANIAN PROTESTS ARE DIFFERENT FROM 2009

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following op-ed, written by Mrs. Maryam Rajavi, the elected President of the National Council of Resistance of Iran, in support of the Iranian quest for freedom, printed in the Wall Street Journal on January 9, 2018.

THESE IRANIAN PROTESTS ARE DIFFERENT FROM 2009

Then, the cause was a rift within the regime. Now, the people are demanding an end to the regime.

The protests in Iran send a cogent message: The clerical regime stands on shaky ground, and the Iranian people are unwavering in their quest to bring it down. Slogans against velayat-e faqih, or absolute clerical rule, called for a real republic and explicitly targeted the regime's Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei and President Hassan Rouhani. This dispels the myth, still harbored by some governments, that Iranians distinguish between moderates and hard-liners in Tehran. It also undercuts flawed arguments depicting a stable regime.

Millions of Iranians live in poverty. Yet Tehran has spent upward of $100 billion on the massacre in Syria, according to reports obtained by the National Council of Resistance of Iran. The chants of ''Death to Hezbollah'' and ''Leave Syria, think about us instead'' clearly demonstrate the people's opposition to the regime's belligerent regional schemes.

The country's official budget this year allocates more than $26.8 billion to military and security affairs and the export of terrorism. This is in addition to the $27.5 billion in military spending from institutions controlled by Mr. Khamenei and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. The budget for health care is a mere $16.3 billion. Weak and vulnerable, the regime spends such astronomical sums on regional meddling as part of its strategy for survival.

Skeptics might point out that Iran has faced protests before. What makes the current uprising different from the 2009 protests?

The 2009 protests were sparked by rifts at the top of the regime. The current protests—which began in Iran's second-largest city of Mashhad and quickly spread across the country—were motivated by rising prices, economic ruin, widespread corruption and resentment toward the regime. This systemic economic mismanagement has its roots in the political system, and it grows worse every day. That is why the demand for regime change surfaced almost immediately. It seems to be the only conceivable outcome.

Another major difference: The 2009 uprising was initially led by the upper middle class, with university students at its core and Tehran as its center. The recent demonstrations span a much broader swath of the population—the middle class, the underprivileged, workers, students, women and young people. Nearly all of society has been represented on the picket line.

Nor is the current uprising tied to any of the regime's internal factions or groupings. There are no illusions about reform or gradual change from within. One of the popular slogans in Tehran is ''Hard-liners, reformers, the game is now over.'' This is yet another sign of the certainty of overthrow. As an Iranian expression goes: Maybe sooner or later, but definitely certain.

The final differentiating factor is the pace of events. In less than 24 hours, the protesters' slogans shifted from economic woes to rejection of the entire regime. The establishment has been caught off guard and is scrambling to find a unified solution. The IRGC declared victory over the protests on Sunday, but this reflects its hopes more than the reality on the ground.

The regime has issued strong warnings against joining the leading opposition group, Mujahedin-e Khalq. One after another, low-ranking and senior officials, joined by the Friday prayer leaders across the country who toe the regime's line, blame the MEK for the protests. The torrent of statements by regime officials reflect their panic at the expansion of the nationwide uprising and the rising popularity of the MEK and the National Council of Resistance of Iran.

The religious dictatorship has resorted to extensive suppression to confront protesters. The IRCG has killed at least 50 people and wounded hundreds. By the end of the ninth day of protests, at least 3,000 had been arrested, according to our sources in the country. Numerous reports indicate that security forces literally knock on people's doors and warn them against attending demonstrations. The net of suppression has been cast as wide as possible.

In light of this brutal repression, the international community must not remain silent. The United Nations Security Council must adopt punitive measures against the regime's crimes. This has long been the demand of the Iranian people and opposition. We must not forget that the perpetrators of the horrific 1988 massacre of 30,000 political prisoners are still in power today, holding senior executive and judicial positions while engaging in the murder of protesters in the streets.

Perhaps the final difference between the 2009 protests and the recent uprising will be that the latter succeeds in overthrowing the reviled theocracy in Iran. The people of Iran fervently hope so.

HONORING THE CAREER OF STEPHEN ALFRED

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the extraordinary career of Stephen Alfred of South Kingstown, whose time as Town Manager will soon come to a close after more than forty remarkable years of service. Mr. Alfred's sense of leadership, dedication to community, and perseverance are just a few of the reasons we will miss him upon his retirement.

Alfred quickly found his way into public service after earning his bachelor's degree from Providence College in 1974. While pursuing his graduate degree from the University of Rhode Island the following year, he interned at South Kingstown Town Hall where he began working full time after concluding his studies. In 1976, at age twenty-four, he became acting Town Manager—a position made permanent the following year.

Alfred's tenure has spanned an impressive twenty-one Town Councils, and he has overseen South Kingstown's growth from a town of 16,000 to one of more than 30,000 residents . Through the years, he has earned the immense respect and admiration of his

colleagues and fellow citizens while focusing on fostering and maintaining a sense of community. He will retire as the longest-serving town manager or administrator in the state, which is a well-deserved reflection of his dedication to public service.

I join the residents of South Kingstown and the entire state of Rhode Island in expressing deep gratitude for Mr. Alfred's contributions, and I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. REX GORDON, JR.

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of one of Mississippi's most devoted citizens and public servants, Mr. Rex Gordon, Jr. Mr. Gordon passed away on Saturday, December 2, 2017. William Faulkner, Rex Gordon's favorite author said, "To understand the world, you must first understand a place like Mississippi." Rex Gordon loved our great state and embraced everyone he encountered. His passion was to help others and through every role that he assumed, Mr. Gordon accomplished that task. As a public figure, Mr. Gordon led by example—always placing God, family, and community above himself.

Mr. Gordon met his wife, Patricia, while a student at Pascagoula High School. They were married in 1970. While Mrs. Gordon attended Mississippi University for Women, Mr. Gordon pursued his college education including one year at the University of Alabama where he was a walk-on football player under Coach Bear Bryant. He later attended the Mississippi College School of Law where he earned his law degree.

The Gordons moved to my hometown of Union, Mississippi in 1984. It would not be long before Mr. Gordon became a "fixture in the community" as Mrs. Gordon likes to say. He opened a private law practice in Union, and Mr. Gordon's life would soon become a public one in service to his fellow man. He served as Newton County Attorney and Union Municipal Judge for 30 years. He also served 20 years as attorney for the Union Public School District. Mrs. Gordon said her husband was known for his devotion to public service, but what many may not have known was that he never wanted to take credit for his good deeds. He was a humble man.

Mr. Gordon also devoted his time to his favorite sport—football. When he was not cheering for the Ole Miss Rebels, you could find him on a Friday night in the press box at the Union High School football stadium. He was known as the "Voice of the Yellow Jackets." You could say he was one of my high school's biggest fans. Mr. Gordon showed his team spirit every chance he got.

Mr. Gordon was an inquisitive man who was always eager for good conversation and a cup of coffee. He was the founder and charter member of Ward's Morning Coffee Club. The men Mr. Gordon fellowshipped with each morning over coffee at Ward's Fastfood, served as the honorary pallbearers at his funeral. Mr. Gordon was also an active member at Union Methodist Church and known for his desire to cheer people up.

Most importantly, Mr. Gordon was a man of family and faith. He and his wife, Patricia, were married for 47 years. Together, they have two children and five grandchildren. Both daughters live close to home which the Gordons consider a true blessing.

Mr. Gordon will always be remembered for his many accomplishments, but perhaps more for his determination to rise above all obstacles in the pursuit of happiness. Invictus, Mr. Gordon' s favorite poem, says it best. Therefore, I include in the RECORD the following excerpt:

Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods may be
For my unconquerable soul

It matters not how straight the gait,
How changed with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate:
I am the captain of my soul.

My thoughts and prayers are with Mr. Gordon's family and friends.

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL ACT OF 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 2018

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Miscellaneous Tariff Bill.

As you know, I represent the great state of North Carolina which has more MTBs recommended by the ITC than any other state.

Of the 1,800 petitions from the ITC, around 330 of those were submitted by North Carolinians. This represents a tax cut for them of $70 million in 2018 alone.

This legislation benefits a wide variety of manufacturers in my home state, and across the nation. Textile manufacturers like Glen Raven, or crop science companies around the Research Triangle Park, or appliance manufacturers in Charlotte, would all benefit under this plan.

Requiring American manufacturers to pay tariffs for imported products not made in the United States puts them at a competitive disadvantage to other countries. This bill is an opportunity to cut those tariffs, which are taxes, and have them reinvested in our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this very important bill.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. GARY CANTER

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of the co-owner of the iconic Canter's Deli, Mr. Gary Canter—a beloved son, husband, and father—who passed away on December 26, 2017 at the age of 58.

Gary was born on March 18, 1959 to Alan and Elizabeth Canter. Gary was the grandson of Ben Canter, who started Canter's Deli with his brothers in 1931 in Boyle Heights. The deli was later moved to Fairfax in 1953 and has been one of the oldest and most famous eateries in Los Angeles.

Gary's career at the deli spanned over 43 years. He began working in the bakery at the age of 15, selling rye bread, danishes, and coffee cakes. After a few years, he moved to the deli counter and sold corned beef, pastrami, and brisket. By the age of 21, he was promoted to manager and oversaw 125 employees and the day-to-day operations of the 24 hours a day, 7 days a week restaurant. Gary helped expand Canter's Deli to Las Vegas in 2016 in two locations, the Linq and the Tivoli Village.

Gary was a person with a big heart and personality. He lit up any room he walked into and was known for calling those who he cared for, "Buddy Buddy".

Gary is survived by his wife, Traci, his daughter, Jenifer, and his parents, Alan and Elizabeth, whom I hope take comfort in the way Gary lived his life. May his memory be a blessing to us all.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN MICHAEL SCOTT FOR HIS 16 YEARS OF SERVICE AT THE GLOVERSVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Captain Michael Scott on his retirement from the Gloversville Police Department after 16 years of service.

Since starting with the Gloversville Police Department in 2000, Captain Scott has been instrumental to the Department's growth and success. After serving as a patrol officer, police sergeant, and administrative sergeant, he attained the rank of police captain in 2016. To name just a few of his important contributions to the Department, Captain Scott oversaw the implementation of body worn cameras, energy device programs, and the transition of the department from the Uniform Crime Report to the Incident Based Reporting system. One of Captain Scott's proudest accomplishments is serving in the role of Accreditation Manager in the NYS Law Enforcement Accreditation program that the Department earned for five years. Captain Scott also held the position of public information officer, where he handled media requests, distributed press releases, and more. A true public servant, Captain Scott served in the Navy and the National Guard prior to his career in the Gloversville Police Department, which included deployment in Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to thank Captain Scott for his years of hard work and dedication to his community, and wish him all the best in the years ahead.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT MAJOR RAY V. WILBURN (RET.)

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of retired United States Marine Corps Sergeant Major Ray V. Wilburn, who passed away on January 2, 2018 at the age of 98. Born in Wolf City, Texas in 1919, Sgt. Maj. Wilburn hitchhiked 75 miles to enlist in the Marine Corps in 1939. Following the outbreak of World War II, he was assigned to 3rd Artillery Battalion, 10th Marine Regiment in the Solomon Islands. His unit eventually saw combat on the islands of Guadalcanal, Tarawa, and Tulagi.

At the beginning of the Korean War, Sgt. Maj. Wilburn was an artillery instructor at Camp Del Mar, California, but in 1951 he received orders to serve with the 2nd Battalion, 11th Marine Regiment in Korea. His unit was assigned to Artillery Valley where they endured constant barrages of enemy fire from 122mm rounds.

In 1967, Sgt. Maj. Wilburn was sent to Vietnam with the 1st Medical Battalion where he was lauded by his superiors for his leadership and mettle. Nightly Viet Cong mortar attacks forced he and his fellow Marines to perform their duties in flak vests and helmets.

The Marine Corps granted Sgt. Maj. Wilburn's request to serve more than 30 years, however in 1971 he was forced to medically retire after 31 years of service. If given the opportunity, I have no doubt that Sgt. Maj. Wilburn would have served his beloved Marine Corps another 31 years. I would like to pass along my condolences to his family and friends, and I thank God everyday for men like Sgt. Maj. Wilburn. Semper Fi.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote for roll call vote 18 on January 16, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 18.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT AND MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE ACT MODERNIZATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3445, African Growth and Opportunity Act and Millennium Challenge Act ("AGOA and MCA Modernization Act"), because it provides assistance to certain sub-Saharan African countries to improve their economies and foster trade with the U.S.

I have long supported trade ties between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, as I believe this trade relationship would be mutually advantageous for both parties involved.

In 2016, 39 of the 48 countries in sub-Saharan Africa were designated as AGOA-eligible, according to the House Foreign Affairs Committee's report on the bill.

Top imports to the U.S. under AGOA include energy products, transportation equipment, and textiles, according to the International Trade Administration.

The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) is a foreign aid agency that provides grants to lower-income countries for specific projects to promote economic growth.

It invests in countries through compacts—which have ranged from $66 million in Cape Verde to almost $700 million in Morocco and Tanzania—as well as smaller "threshold agreements" that help countries become eligible for a compact, according to the committee report.

It has distributed $10.8 billion through compacts and $583.6 million through threshold agreements.

With Africa's consumer spending expected to reach one trillion dollars, now is the time to accelerate this important trade relationship.

The AGOA program and the MCC would have new responsibilities and reporting requirements under an amended version of H.R. 3445.

Under H.R. 3445, the president would have to establish a website for AGOA that includes information about technical assistance provided by the U.S. Agency for International Development's regional trade hubs and links to U.S. embassies in AGOA countries.

After each U.S.-Sub-Saharan Africa Trade and Economic Cooperation Forum, H.R. 3445 would require the president to publish the outcomes and an assessment of progress made by members and the private sector toward meeting previous commitments.

Under H.R. 3445, the State Department would have to direct U.S. embassies in sub-Saharan Africa to promote AGOA and link to the AGOA website on their websites.

The president would be directed to:

Develop policies and encourage the provision of technical assistance to facilitate trade cooperation among AGOA countries;

Train businesses and government officials on how to access AGOA benefits; and

Provide capacity building for African entrepreneurs and trade associations.

H.R. 3445 would set new requirements for AGOA's website and outreach work.

H.R. 3445 would modify country eligibility criteria for MCC compacts and allow countries to enter into concurrent compacts.

According to a committee summary, H.R. 3445 would redefine and stabilize movement between the low income and lower middle income candidate country pools, consistent with authorizing language that has been carried in annual appropriations bills since FY 2012.

According to the committee report, countries would be eligible for assistance if their per capita income does not exceed the lower middle income country threshold established by the World Bank's International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which is $4,035.

Countries would be eligible for low income assistance if their per capita income is among the 75 lowest countries.

Otherwise, they would still be eligible for lower middle income assistance.

The formula under current law is not based on an income ranking.

If changes in a country's income caused it to move between categories, its assistance level would change after two subsequent fiscal years.

H.R. 3445 would also require countries to demonstrate a commitment to supporting civil society to be eligible for participation.

Before being selected for participation, the MCC would have to report to its governing board on the country's treatment of civil society and any laws it has that regulate the freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, and internet use.

The reports would be required before the board approved compacts for the next seven years.

A country's improvement on criteria that were relevant to its initial compact would be considered when determining eligibility for a subsequent, non-concurrent compact.

We should support the efforts of the AGOA program as it provides assistance to sub-Saharan African countries, improves these countries' economies, and helps to facilitate trade between these countries and the U.S.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3445.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WORLD WAR II VETERAN JOSEPH A. BRUNO

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Joseph A. Bruno, a World War II Veteran who passed away on December 20, 2017.

Originally from Willsboro, New York, Joe enlisted in the United States Army in the Fall of 1942, where he served his country as a member of the Signal Corps. After completing signals training at Plattsburgh State Teachers College in June of 1942 and receiving follow-on training, Joe deployed to England with his unit. On July 22, 1944, Joe's unit landed in France, where he worked to establish a trans-Atlantic communications capability. Later, during the Battle of the Bulge, Joe and his unit were rushed to the front lines to hold the line against a German advance. Following the German surrender in 1945, Joe was slated to be shipped to the Pacific theater. His unit received word of Japan's surrender while at sea, and his ship was diverted to Boston.

In October of 1945, Joe was discharged from the Army at the rank of Technician Fifth Grade and returned to his hometown in Willsboro, where he worked with the railroad until his retirement in 1979.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to offer my deepest condolences to Joe's family and friends. Joe was an exemplary member of the community and his service to his country will not be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DENVER CHINESE SCHOOL

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 20th Anniversary of the Denver Chinese School (DCS). This exemplary cultural institution has provided our community with numerous intrinsic services which include education in Chinese culture and language, as well as the opportunity for Chinese Americans to work in collaboration with each other to further enrich and grow in Colorado. I am proud to represent the largest Chinese community in Colorado in my Congressional District.

Founded by current President HuiLiang Liu, DCS started as a single class in the Chinese Evangelical Church of Denver, today, the Denver Chinese School encompasses three different campuses located in Highlands Ranch, the Denver Tech Center, and Lakewood, with over 400 students, 80 staff members, and countless volunteers. Today, it is the largest Chinese school in Colorado.

The incredible value of Denver Chinese School has been recognized both at home and abroad. DCS has been certified by the Chinese Association as a ''Model School,'' and its curriculum has been incorporated into the Douglas County School District. Students are now able to take classes, directed and taught by dedicated staffmembers, teachers, and volunteers, and receive high school credit.

The Denver Chinese School provides services which aim to enlighten the community with educational and cultural enrichment. DCS events, like the Colorado Chinese New Year Celebration (CNYC), provide a platform that brings communities together to network, engage with political figures, and obtain cultural awareness.

Throughout its 20 years of service, DCS has proved itself to be an excellent organization and a valuable asset to the state of Colorado. I look forward to, and wish the Denver Chinese School nothing but continued success in its future. I include in the RECORD the names of all DCS principals who have served over the past 20 years.

DCS Principals:
DCS one campus:
1998 to 2004: Huiliang Liu
2004–2006: Ann Qi
DTC Campus
2006–2008:Jianqiu Han
2008–2011: Jianhui Shen
2011–2013: Yiping Luo
2013–2015: Jing Mei
2015–Present: Bin Zhang
Highlands Ranch Campus
2006–2008: Yunhan Zheng
2008–2010: Weichang Zhang
2010–2012: Wenhua Hua
2012–2015: Rui Ding
2015–2017: Xiaoyan Li
2017–Present: Xiuping Wang
Lakewood Campus
2010–2011:Jeane Huang
2011–2013: Qingzhong Zhao
2013–2015: Lily Han
2015–2017: Chunhe Dai
2017–Present: Liang Chen

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. EARNEST ''ERNIE'' GREEN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend a respected athlete, an accomplished businessman, a Georgia native, and a distinguished graduate of William H. Spencer High School in Columbus, Georgia, Mr. Earnest ''Ernie'' Green. As the U.S. Representative for the 2nd Congressional District, I am proud to share that Spencer High School will hold a football banquet and retirement ceremony for Ernie's jersey number ''29'' on Saturday, January 20, 2018 at 7:00 pm.

Ernie, a native of Columbus, Georgia, was a product of the Muscogee County public school system, and an alumnus of William H. Spencer High School's Class of 1958. Following high school, he enrolled at the University of Louisville, where he excelled in both football and baseball, rushing for 1,500 yards and being offered professional contracts for both sports.

After spending his college years at the University of Louisville in 1961, Ernie was drafted in the 14th round of the 1962 National Football League (NFL) Draft by the Green Bay Packers. He was later traded to the Cleveland Browns, where he played halfback and fullback from 1962 to 1968. During his career with the Cleveland Browns, he rushed for over 3,204 yards, and won the NFL Championship in 1964. Ernie also played on the winning teams in the American Football Conference (AFC)-National Football Conference (NFC) Pro Bowls in 1967 and 1968. Ernie played a total of seven seasons with the NFL, gaining 2,036 yards and 195 passes. After receiving a knee injury he made the transition from football player to field coach for the Browns' running backs.

After a successful career with the NFL, Ernie went on to become a businessman, civic leader, and philanthropist. In 1981, he co-founded Earnest Green (EG) Industries, Incorporated, a manufacturing plant that produces high quality products pertaining to the automotive, medical science, industrial, and consumer industries. Over time, his business expanded to include eleven plants, and locations in six states, Canada, the Dominican Republic, and China.

Ernie has received several awards and honors for his philanthropic efforts. Some of these include: the Outstanding Philanthropist of Ohio by the Association of Fundraising Professionals in 2010 and induction into the Cleveland Browns' Legends Association in 2012. Another noteworthy milestone of Ernie's is his 13th anniversary as a breast cancer survivor, which was achieved in 2018.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join my wife Vivian and me, along with the more than 730,000 residents of the Second Congressional District of Georgia, in congratulating and commending Mr. Earnest ''Ernie'' Green for his outstanding athleticism, compelling courage, keen sense of business, and dedication to philanthropy. It has been said that: ''You make your living by what you get, but you make your life by what you give.'' Mr. Earnest ''Ernie'' Green truly made his life giving so much to enhance the lives of so many for so long.

APPLY ALL DIPLOMATIC PRESSURE POSSIBLE TO NORTH KOREA

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, North Korea continues to be one of the great menaces of our time. Its relentless pursuit of nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them onto American shores, threatens the lives of millions and needlessly risks a major war.

However, this evil regime has not only looked to develop nuclear arms to hold the world hostage and murder countless innocent people. It is expanding its arsenal to introduce some of the most horrific weapons of war this world has ever seen. Based on what evidence is available, North Korea has built or continues to research a broad range of chemical and biological weapons that could unleash untold savagery on its neighbors and Americans in the region.

Furthermore, the regime has amassed the conventional military forces needed to rain down destruction on its southern neighbor on a scale approaching the level of carnage that a nuclear weapon can produce. Millions of people living in Seoul are within range of thousands of North Korean rockets and artillery.

On immediate order from the supreme leader, these guns can bombard the South Korean capital and dozens of communities along the demilitarize zone with high explosive shells and chemical warheads, killing tens of thousands of civilians in the first hour of a conflict.The urgency of the North Korean threat cannot be understated and must be understood in full context.

The regime has shown us its brutality and willingness to use globally condemned weapons. Just last year, Kim Jong Un's half-brother was assassinated using VX nerve agent in a busy Malaysian airport.

VX is banned by the Chemical Weapons Convention and is more potent than any other chemical weapon devised by man. Its ability to virtually kill on contact, gives little time to treat individuals exposed. And unlike other chemical weapons, it has the ability to sit for long periods of time where it was dispersed, creating a deadly obstacle for medical professionals trying to respond to a VX attack.

The recklessness of Little Kim's decision to use it in public place shows how little regard he has for innocent human life. With the availability of drone technology, the North Korean regime could easily spray the nerve agent across heavily populated areas. It is unclear how we should respond to such an incident. With nuclear weapons, we have a clearly stated policy: if you use yours, we will respond with ours.

We must develop and communicate a clear strategy to how we will respond if Little Kim were to use chemical or biological weapons in his next clash with the U.S. and South Korea. When the Syrian regime conducted a chemical attack on its own people in 2013, then-President Obama did not have a clearly held 'red-line.'

The Obama administration displayed little resolve and did not respond with force—instead it made a deal with the Russians so supposedly destroy the Assad regime's chemical weapons stockpiles. But last spring we saw the Syrians use chemical weapons again. Fortunately the Trump administration did not waver, and respond with sufficient force to deter further use of the deadly weapons.

This example demonstrates that if we show weakness in the face of these horrific weapons, it will only invite continued use of them. We should also consider where the Assad regime acquired these weapons of mass destruction. Available evidence points to the Kim regime. And despite the Obama administrations deal with Putin, reports suggest Assad may be trying to acquire more chemical weapons from North Korea.

Last August, the United Nations revealed that two North Korean shipments destined for Syria were intercepted. While it is unclear what the cargo was, we know they were intended for the Syrian agency responsible for Assad's chemical weapons program.

So while Little Kim may not have ordered an attack with his chemical weapons arsenal yet, he is actively assisting those rogue actors who are using chemical weapons.

Recent reports also indicate that North Korea is developing the means to produce biological weapons on a massive scale. We do not know if he has deployed these new bioweapons, but given the example he has shown with his nuclear and chemical programs, it is not unreasonable to believe they will be soon.

This evil regime has repeated demonstrated that it rarely hesitates when pushing the limits of international resolve. To prevent North Korea from expanding its arsenal of deadly weapons and proliferating them to the world's worst actors, we must continue to apply all pressure available.

Our sanctions should block all sources of funding and material for this regime. Only when Little Kim feels the pain and sees that his dangerous pursuit weapons of mass murder will result in his own demise, will he be tempted to back down. America must lead the way, and show that any use of these deadly weapons will be met with a harsh response.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF WILLIE O'REE BREAKING THE NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE COLOR BARRIER AND HIS INDELIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SPORT OF HOCKEY

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1958, sixty years ago today, a 22-year-old Boston Bruins winger stepped onto the ice of the famed Montreal Forum to battle the Montreal Canadiens, forever changing the face of the National Hockey League. Though he played in only two NHL games that year and forty-three more during the 1960–61 season, this player's lasting impact upon the League and the sport of ice hockey continues to this very day. In remembrance of his historic accomplishment, I want to take a few minutes to pay tribute to Willie O'Ree, on the anniversary of his becoming the first black person to play in an NHL game, and for his continued efforts to grow the game and personify the belief that hockey is for everyone.

Without question, life was not easy for the few black hockey players trying to break into the professional ranks in the 1950s. America was still dealing with segregation and Jim Crow, and racism was an everyday reality for black people everywhere. No black person was immune to this reality, not even a young black Canadian hockey player from Fredericton, New Brunswick. While chasing his boyhood dream of becoming a professional hockey player, Willie O'Ree faced more than his fair share of racial epithets and abuse from players and spectators alike. However, his inner strength, dedication, and determination propelled him above his racial antagonists and set him on a course that would ultimately prove historic and transformational.

And not only did Willie overcome the racial climate of his day, he also overcame a potentially career ending injury that almost no one knew about. When Willie was a 19-year-old playing junior hockey in Canada, he was struck by an errant puck that left him blind in his right eye. The doctors that treated him told him he would never play again. Thankfully for us, he followed his heart and not their prognosis. But Willie did keep the fact that he was blind in his right eye a secret from coaches, players, and even his family for fear that they might keep him from the sport he loved.

Following his time with the Bruins, Willie spent most of the remainder of his career in the Western Hockey League, where he played for both the Los Angeles Blades and San Diego Gulls. He ended a successful 21-year professional hockey career in 1979. However, the best was yet to come with respect to Willie's relationship with hockey and the NHL. For as much as he was a historic game changer on the ice in 1958, today he is recognized as one of most influential and respected advocates for the game off the ice.

In 1998, forty years after his initial impact as a player, Willie again significantly impacted the NHL and the game of hockey, but this time as the League's Diversity Ambassador and Director of Youth Development. Since reconnecting with the League, Willie has been a passionate and tireless teacher, mentor and friend to tens of thousands of young kids, from diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds, who have come to embrace and play the great game of hockey. His legacy continues to be on display in organizations like the Ft. Dupont Ice Hockey Club, here in Washington, DC, which is the oldest minority ice hockey club in North America, and SCORE Boston, an inner-city hockey program located in my district. Willie's legacy also can be seen through the NHL stars of today and the future stars of tomorrow. Last year's NHL All Star game featured the largest contingency of black players ever, with one of the players, Wayne Simmonds, being named the game's Most Valuable Player. Next month, Jordan Greenway, a member of the Boston University hockey team, will be the first African American to play hockey for the United States in the Olympics.

Earlier this week, we celebrated the national holiday honoring the life and legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Universally recognized as one of the world's most eloquent and passionate defenders of civil and human rights, Dr. King, in his now famous ''I Have a Dream'' speech, talked of one day living in a nation where we will be judged not by the color of our skin but by the content of our character. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that during the same week we are celebrating Dr. King's legacy, we are acknowledging the accomplishments of Willie O'Ree: a man whose character allowed him to overcome the challenges surrounding the color of his skin and, in doing so, changed the sport of hockey forever.

DACA

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong and unwavering support of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program (DACA) and unyielding opposition to the President's decision, announced by the Attorney General, to rescind a policy that liberated 800,000 young persons—124,000 of them in Texas—from the shadows of life, welcomed them into the mainstream, and encouraged them to realize their potential and achieve the American Dream.

At the heart of the Trump Administration's cruel and heartless and misguided decision to rescind DACA is the specious claim that President Obama lacked the constitutional and statutory authority to take executive actions to implement the DACA policy.

That is why I offered an amendment to the Commerce, Justice, Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2018, (Division C of Rules Committee Print 115–31) that would have prohibited the Administration from using appropriated funds to implement its decision to rescind DACA.

Specifically, that Jackson Lee Amendment provided the following section at the end of Division E of the bill:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the Memorandum of September 5, 2017, from the Acting Secretary of Homeland Security pertaining to ''Rescission of the June 15, 2012 Memorandum Entitled ''Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children.''

Regrettably, this Jackson Lee Amendment was not made in order by the Rules Committee.

There was no need for the President to make any decisions about DACA; there was no real deadline pending, no actual court case, no legal requirement.

And in my congressional district, we are still mourning the loss of the heroic DREAMER, Alonso Guillen, who came to the U.S. from Mexico as a child, and died here when his boat capsized while he was rescuing survivors of the flooding caused by Hurricane Harvey in the Houston area.

The President and Attorney General should not have created a crisis just because they appear not to like the ethnic groups from which most DREAMERS come.

Not to mention the so-called President, who called ''shithole countries'' the places he finds undesirable, likely because of his racist ways.

There is no heart in ending DACA and leaving the fate of 800,000 young persons in limbo and at the mercy of a Republican Congress that has passed no major legislation and has no guarantee that the President would even sign a bill if they do.

Republicans in Congress need to bring H.R. 3440, the Dream Act of 2017, to the floor right now and vote for it so it can pass both houses of Congress with a veto-proof majority.

Mr. Speaker, now let me briefly discuss why the executive actions taken by President Obama are reasonable, responsible, and within his constitutional authority.

Pursuant to Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution, the President, the nation's Chief Executive, "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed."

In addition to establishing the President's obligation to execute the law, the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted the "Take Care" Clause as ensuring presidential control over those who execute and enforce the law and the authority to decide how best to enforce the laws. See, e.g., Arizona v. United States; Bowsher v. Synar; Buckley v. Valeo; Printz v. United States; Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB.

Every law enforcement agency, including the agencies that enforce immigration laws, has "prosecutorial discretion"—the inherent power to decide whom to investigate, arrest, detain, charge, and prosecute.

Thus, enforcement agencies, including the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), properly may exercise their discretion to devise and implement policies specific to the laws they are charged with enforcing, the population they serve, and the problems they face so that they can prioritize our nation's resources to meet mission critical enforcement goals.

Mr. Speaker, deferred action has been utilized in our nation for decades by Administrations headed by presidents of both parties without controversy or challenge.

In fact, as far back as 1976, INS and DHS leaders have issued at least 11 different memoranda providing guidance on the use of similar forms of prosecutorial discretion.

Executive authority to take action is thus "fairly wide," and the federal government's discretion is extremely "broad" as the Supreme Court held in the recent case of *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012), an opinion written by Justice Kennedy and joined by Chief Justice Roberts:

"Congress has specified which aliens may be removed from the United States and the procedures for doing so. Aliens may be removed if they were inadmissible at the time of entry, have been convicted of certain crimes, or meet other criteria set by federal law. Removal is a civil, not criminal, matter. A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all. If removal proceedings commence, aliens may seek asylum and other discretionary relief allowing them to remain in the country or at least to leave without formal removal." (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

The Court's decision in Arizona v. United States, also strongly suggests that the executive branch's discretion in matters of deportation may be exercised on an individual basis, or it may be used to protect entire classes of individuals such as "[u]nauthorized workers trying to support their families" or immigrants who originate from countries torn apart by internal conflicts:

"Discretion in the enforcement of immigration law—embraces immediate human concerns. Unauthorized workers trying to support their families, for example, likely pose less danger than alien smugglers or aliens who commit a serious crime. The equities of an individual case may turn on many factors, including whether the alien has children born in the United States, long ties to the community, or a record of distinguished military service.

Some discretionary decisions involve policy choices that bear on this Nation's international relations. Returning an alien to his own country may be deemed inappropriate even where he has committed a removable offense or fails to meet the criteria for admission. The foreign state may be mired in civil war, complicit in political persecution, or enduring conditions that create a real risk that the alien or his family will be harmed upon return.

The dynamic nature of relations with other countries requires the Executive Branch to ensure that enforcement policies are consistent with this Nation's foreign policy with respect to these and other realities."

Exercising thoughtful discretion in the enforcement of the nation's immigration law saves scarce taxpayer funds, optimizes limited resources, and produces results that are more humane and consistent with America's reputation as the most compassionate nation on earth.

Mr. Speaker, a DREAMER (an undocumented student) seeking to earn her college degree and aspiring to attend medical school to —better herself and her new community is not a threat to the nation's security.

Law abiding but unauthorized immigrants doing honest work to support their families pose far less danger to society than human traffickers, drug smugglers, or those who have committed a serious crime.

President Obama was correct in concluding that exercising his discretion regarding the implementation of DACA enhances-the safety of all members of the public, serves national security interests, and furthers the public interest in keeping families together.

Mr. Speaker, according to numerous studies conducted by the Congressional Budget Office, Social Security Administration, and Council of Economic Advisors, the DACA generates substantial economic benefits to our nation.

For example, unfreezing DAPA and expanded DACA is estimated to increase GDP by $230 billion and create an average of 28,814 jobs per year over the next 10 years.

That is a lot of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in exercising his broad discretion in the area of removal proceedings, President Obama acted responsibly and reasonably in determining the circumstances in which it makes sense to pursue removal and when it does not.

In exercising this broad discretion, President Obama did nothing was novel or unprecedented.

Let me cite just a few examples of executive action taken by American presidents, both Republican and Democratic, on issues affecting immigrants over the past 35 years:

In 1987, President Ronald Reagan used executive action in 1987 to allow 200,000 Nicaraguans facing deportation to apply for relief from expulsion and work authorization.

In 1980, President Jimmy Carter exercised parole authority to allow Cubans to enter the U.S., and about 123,000 "Mariel Cubans" were paroled into the U.S. by 1981.

In 1990, President George H.W. Bush issued an executive order that granted Deferred Enforced Departure

(DED) to certain nationals of the People's Republic of China who were in the United States.

In 1992, the Bush administration granted DED to certain nationals of El Salvador.

In 1997, President Bill Clinton issued an executive order granting DED to certain Haitians who had arrived in the United States before Dec. 31, 1995.

In 2010, the Obama Administration began a policy of granting parole to the spouses, parents, and children of military members.

Mr. Speaker, because of President Obama's leadership and visionary executive action, 124,000 undocumented immigrants in my home state of Texas have received deferred action.

Ninety-one percent of these immigrants are employed or in school and contribute $6.3 billion annually to the Texas economy and $460.3 billion to the national economy.

Mr. Speaker, let me note that DACA was and is a welcome development but not a substitute for undertaking the comprehensive reform and modernization of the nation's immigration laws supported by the American people.

Only Congress can do that.

America's borders are dynamic, with constantly evolving security challenges.

Border security must be undertaken in a manner that allows actors to use pragmatism and common sense.

Comprehensive immigration reform is desperately needed to ensure that Lady Liberty's lamp remains the symbol of a land that welcomes immigrants to a community of immigrants and does so in a manner that secures our borders and protects our homeland.

Instead of wasting time scapegoating DREAMERS, we should instead seize the opportunity to pass legislation that secures our borders, preserves America's character as the most open and welcoming country in the history of the world, and will yield hundreds of billions of dollars in economic growth.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF BEV FITZPATRICK TO THE ROANOKE REGION

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, during my service in Congress, I have had the great opportunity to meet men and women in Virginia's Sixth Congressional District who exemplify what it means to serve. One of these individuals is Beverly T. "Bev" Fitzpatrick, Jr. I've had the great honor of knowing Bev for many years, and I have seen just how much of an impact he has had on the Roanoke region.

Bev grew up in South Roanoke. He graduated from Virginia Tech in 1970 and went on to serve in the United States Army. After his time in the military, Bev returned home to Roanoke. Over the years, he has worked in a variety of fields, including finance, economic development, education, public television, and

transportation—impacting western Virginia in his own unique way in each position. He even served on the Roanoke City Council. It would be difficult to convince me that there is something Bev has not done, and done well for that fact.

After serving as the head of the Virginia Museum of Transportation in Roanoke for 11 years, Bev retired from his post of Executive Director on December 31, 2017. During this time, he oversaw the complete turnaround of the museum. Attendance increased from 12,000 to about 50,000 visitors a year. The staff grew and the annual operations budget more than doubled. Thanks to his dedication, the museum highlights Virginia's transportation history as well as the Roanoke region's rich rail heritage. Without Bev's leadership the Virginia Museum of Transportation would not be the well-known and respected place it is today.

Bev was also instrumental in bringing the historic Norfolk & Western Class J 611 steam engine back online. In 2015, after much hard work and multiple rounds of negotiations, the 611 began operating passenger rail excursions, attracting railroad enthusiasts from around the world and across the country and local families alike. It is America's railroad history brought to life.

Bev Fitzpatrick's legacy is one of service. His love for transportation and the Roanoke Valley is seen in every comer of the museum, inside and out. I want to thank him for making the museum his final destination in a career of service to the community. It's been a true pleasure to work closely with him over the years on so many ventures that have benefitted Virginia's Blue Ridge region. I know Bev and his wife, Shirley, look forward to some much-deserved time off to spend with one another and their family and friends.

Congratulations on a well-earned retirement.

HONORING COUNCILMAN JAMES BAYMAN

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Whitley County Councilman James Bayman. For 36 years, Councilman Bayman has represented the townships of Washington, Cleveland, Jefferson and the South precinct of my home town, Columbia City. I had the honor of serving with Councilman Bayman from 2008 through 2010, and I saw firsthand the positive influence he has had on the people of District 4. Councilman Bayman is hard-working, honest and a caring public servant. I wish him the best as he begins the next chapter of his life. Whitley County will miss his leadership and commitment to public service.

SAN JACINTO GIRL SCOUTS HELP HURRICANE HARVEY HEROES

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Girl Scouts Troop of San Jacinto, Texas for their remarkable generosity and dedication to our first responders in the Houston area. When Hurricane Harvey blasted our beloved Houston this past year, it left tremendous destruction in its wake. The damage caused by the hurricane was utterly devastating to communities and left many without homes and no place to seek shelter. Thanks to our first responders, many were able to escape the flooding and retreat to higher ground. We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to those who put their lives on the line to protect our communities during that trying time. The Girl Scouts Troop of San Jacinto is now honoring our Hurricane Harvey heroes in a "sweet" way. The troop has launched the "Cookies-4-Heroes" program, which gives customers the chance to donate cookie purchases to first responders. With many of the Girl Scouts' own families affected by the horrific storm, the cause is near and dear to their hearts. The Girl Scouts are challenging everyone to donate 10,000 cases of cookies by March 25th and I am absolutely certain they will reach their goal; after all Mr. Speaker, who doesn't like Girl Scout cookies? I challenge our Houston community to support those who not only helped us out during the hurricane but who help protect us every day. Our firefighters, paramedics, police officers and countless others who supported those in the Houston community, deserve every bit of recognition and honor they receive. In the Girl Scout handbook, their motto reads, "A Girl Scout is ready to help out wherever she is needed. Willingness to serve is not enough; you must know how to do the job well, even in an emergency." The Girl Scouts Troop of San Jacinto exemplifies what it means to be a Girl Scout and their commitment to our heroes is outstanding. I commend the Girl Scouts Troop of San Jacinto for thinking of others before themselves and honoring those who put their lives on the line each and every day. And that is just the way it is.

IT'S GOD'S WILL

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the presentation of The Congressional Gold Medal to a great American Hero and Icon, Senator Bob J. Dole of Kansas. Therefore, I include in the RECORD this poem penned in his honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

It's God's Will
In life we are tested
Do we somehow meet the challenge to move onward still?
For only when we are armed with great faith, courage, and character,
We all must accept God's will.
And in the coming years,
many a student here
Shall learn of Jefferson,
Washington,
Roosevelt,
Reagan,
Bush,
Kennedy and Lincoln's story.
How sad to think,
They'll not speak of the one who could have been of the greatest,
And know of his glory.
For one Robert Dole's life stands
As a shining example of faith,
A great true golden lesson of just how,
"Against all odds,"
From a tragedy to a triumph this wonderfully true authentic American folk tale
And not know of or tell,
Of how a dirt poor boy from Kansas grew up so very strong
Who gave it all away upon a battlefield of honor,
Saving a comrade
No, no, they'll not sing of that song
And while lying at death's door
Armed with only his faith in our Lord,
somehow he miraculously endured
After years of operations and all hope given up,
He walked out of that hospital door
Oh what folklore,
And yet no President's book will ever tell
Of how he began as a freshman Congressman and would not stop
And because of his great leadership by his party,
And his country one day high above a pedestal he'd be placed atop
Nor, will it ever be told
Of his kind and warm heart of gold,
And his wonderful sense of humor so
And truly great charm
And while throughout his life's path,
Each and every heart he touched and cared for he left quite warm:
Mothers,
Fathers,
Sisters,
Brothers,
Rabbis,
Teachers,
Priests and Preachers
You may not speak of Presidents as you speak of Bob Dole
And yet his exemplary courage, character, kindness, leadership,
And great faith in our Lord all our children must be told
And standing there on that at last final day of defeat,
Knowing he was far, far, the better man still
He called upon The Lord and spoke these words of faith for all to hear
"It's God's Will",

COST ESTIMATE ON H.R. 4553, THE TERRORIST SCREENING AND TARGETING REVIEW ACT OF 2017

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, the following cost estimate for H.R. 4553, the Terrorist Screening and Targeting Review Act of 2017, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office was not made available to the Committee at the time of filing of the legislative report by the Committee Homeland Security.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, January 18, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4553, the Terrorist Screening and Targeting Review Act of 2017.

If you wish further details on this estimates, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Pickford.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, *Director*.

Enclosure.

H.R. 4553—TERRORIST SCREENING AND TARGETING REVIEW ACT OF 2017

As reported by the House Committee on Homeland Security on January 9, 2018

H.R. 4553 would direct the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to conduct a review of the National Targeting Center in the Department of Homeland Security and the Terrorist Screening Center in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The review would cover the authorization, funding; management, and operation of the centers, and it would be completed within a year of enactment.

Considering the cost of recent GAO work involving those centers and the level of effort for similar homeland security reports, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would cost $1 million over the 2018–2019 period, assuming the availability of appropriated funds. Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4553 would not increase direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 4553 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Matthew Pickford. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

RECOGNIZING CRAIG RADDATZ FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Craig Raddatz of Lake in the Hills, Illinois for his generous contributions to the Community Unit School District 300 Food Pantry. For over 11 years, Mr. Raddatz has worked to assist families in need.

Beginning as a volunteer for Willow Creek Community Church in South Barrington, Ilinois Mr. Raddatz discovered a true passion for public service when he was assigned to a team working with the Crystal Lake, Illinois Food Pantry to serve those in need. He then went on to serve as a team leader for a mobile food pantry program run by the Northern Illinois Food Bank in Carpentersville, Illinois. Due to the program's success, Mr. Raddatz approached Community Unit School District to expand and house a permanent pantry onsite.

In the past year, the District 300 Food Pantry has served nearly 2,300 people—students, employees and families—within the district. Open weekly, the pantry is independently managed and run by 250 volunteers, including students, who served 3,300 hours last year. In recognition of this contribution, the District 300 Food Pantry has been nominated by the Northern Kane County Chamber of Commerce for Nonprofit of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, and distinguished colleagues, please join me in recognizing Craig Raddatz for his contributions to the School District 300 Food Pantry. Craig is the true definition of an advocate.

HONORING KRIS SADUR

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kris Sadur, who is retiring after serving for 10 years as a remarkable Constituent Advocate/Outreach Coordinator in my Chicago district office. Kris' inspiring career included assisting and supporting senior citizens, health care consumers, the disability community, educators, students, artists, women's rights advocates, and ALL the constituents of the 9th Congressional District.

Kris has helped thousands upon thousands of Illinois 9th Congressional District residents throughout her ten years. She is an expert on issues affecting the senior citizen and disability community, including Medicare, Medicare Part D, Social Security, health care, senior housing, nursing homes, and postal issues.

Kris has earned a reputation as a go-to person who can solve problems, cut through red tape, and get things done for constituents. Her expertise in Social Security and Medicare have been invaluable to residents of the 9th Congressional District and to me and my office.

Kris is a fighter. I appreciated hearing her on the phone with government agencies, because she did not take no for an answer. She made sure that constituents were getting everything they needed and deserved. Sometimes she was told that nothing could be done to fix a problem, but somehow she would find a way. I call her a miracle worker. Recently she heard from a constituent who Social Security had determined was dead. This constituent and her family had been trying to rectify this mistake for weeks but were not successful. Kris was able to get Social Security to recognize that this constituent was alive and well and her benefits were immediately reinstated.

Whenever a problem was brought to her attention, Kris rolled up her sleeves and went to work. She learned that the Medicare website video was not useable for the deaf community and American Sign Language (ASL) users, so she worked with the Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) to get an ASL video on the website, thus getting critical information to hearing-impaired individuals across America. Kris also succeeded in making the local office that administers Medicaid more user-friendly.

Remarkably, Kris has returned or saved constituents more than $6 million since she started working for me. She has been able to rectify errors in benefits and payments made by the Social Security Administration, Medicare and Medicaid, has gotten premiums reduced that were increased erroneously, corrected hospital billing errors, and helped constituents determine which Medicare Part D plan would be the least expensive with the most comprehensive coverage for their prescription needs.

Kris recognized that often seniors couldn't make it into one of our district offices and so she went to them—she established several neighborhood office hour locations across the district where she could meet with constituents in the community, including at the Frisbie Senior Center in Des Plaines, the Park Ridge Senior Center, and Niles Township and New Trier Township offices.

Kris was often invited to make presentations and speak with local organizations about Medicare, Medicare Part D, Social Security and legislation and policies affecting seniors. She spoke regularly to community groups and advocacy organizations, and at senior centers, nursing homes, and senior housing facilities. She has a knack for clearly explaining how complicated federal programs work and a genuine warmth that she communicates to her listeners. She was always in high demand as a speaker and presenter.

Kris has a strong artistic background and she organized and ran the annual Artistic Discovery program in our district, an art competition for high school students in which the winner travels to Washington D.C. to see their art hung in the tunnel between the House buildings and the Capitol. Kris made this a very special competition and event, and she included all special education schools in the district. That led to some very powerful experiences for students in those schools, many of whom had never participated in such an event or had their work recognized. One special education school student had a life-changing experience by participating in this program, all because of Kris.

Prior to working in my office, Kris worked at Age Options, the Area Agency on Aging for Suburban Cook County, where she was an outreach specialist. She was also President and Board Member at Niles Township Department of Special Education, President and Board Member at Temple Judea Mizpah in Skokie and President and Board Member at the Lincolnwood Board of Education in Lincolnwood. Kris also worked at National Able as a Job Development Supervisor and was a Women's Advocate and Budget Analyst at the Illinois House of Representatives.

It is not easy to say goodbye to someone who has been such an essential part of our office team, a leader and role model, an inspiration and a treasured friend. Kris will be able to spend more time with her family, including her husband Al and children Craig and Jill. My office and I, and the residents of the 9th Congressional District, will miss her dearly and wish her every happiness in her retirement. We look forward to continuing our friendships long into the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 17, 2018, I was unable to vote on any legislative measures due to an illness. Had I been present, I would have voted the following:

Roll no. 20, On ordering the previous question providing for consideration of H.R. 3326—World Bank Accountability Act and H.R. 2954—Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act, had I been present I would have voted yes.

Roll no. 21, On adoption of the combined rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3326—the World Bank Accountability Act and H.R. 2954—the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act, had I been present I would have voted yes.

Roll no. 22, On passage of H.R. 4258—Family Self-Sufficiency Act, had I been present I would have voted yes.

Roll no. 23, On agreeing to the amendment of Mr. Connolly of Virginia Part A Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 3326—World Bank Accountability Act, had I been present I would have voted yes.

Roll no. 24, On passage of H.R. 3326—World Bank Accountability Act, had I been present I would have voted yes.

Roll no. 25, On passage of H.R. 4279—Expanding Investment Opportunities Act, had I been present I would have doted yes.

Roll no. 26, On Approving the Journal, had I been present I would have voted yes.

RECOGNIZING THE 555TH HONORS DETACHMENT

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 555th Honors Detachment. Our nation has a solemn duty to honor those who have served. The last honors of a deceased veteran is one of the most important traditions.

In January 2000, Congress guaranteed Veterans' Funeral Honors. This would include at least two service members who will fold and present the American flag and a bugler to sound Taps.

When planning for the Ohio Western Reserve National Cemetery's (OWRNC) first burials in June of 2000, the director sought to provide enhanced military services for deceased veterans by tasking Northern Ohio county veterans groups with providing funeral honors.

Three Wayne County brothers, Lloyd, Arden, and Elton Boyer were concerned about the lack of participation in their county.

There was a need for additional support. Elton suggested forming a new Wayne County Veteran Organization just to provide military rites at the National Cemetery.

As a result of this discussion the 555th Honors Detachment was born. It is sometimes referred to as "The Triple Nickel". The "5" in the name symbolizes the five military services. The 3 fives are symbolic of the three brothers who proposed the concept. By October 2000 there were 16 names on the unit roster and they have grown to contain members from all service branches.

The 555th Honors Detachment has demonstrated itself to be one of the top Veterans' Service Organizations in our Great Nation. The Triple Nickel is heavily involved in veteran and patriotic programs and activities throughout the numerous Wayne County communities and schools.

In 2017, the 555th Honors Detachment performed 375 funeral honors missions and almost 100 private functions. The Triple Nickle has presented itself as a premier veteran service organization worthy of recognition.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE TO LOMBARD, IL BY MR. DENNIS McNICHOLAS

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Dennis McNicholas of Lombard, Illinois on being named the Village of Lombard's Senior Man of the Year for 2017. After 41 years of service to his community, Dennis is well-deserving of this recognition.

Since making Lombard his home in 1976, Mr. McNicholas has been an integral part of the community. He previously served as President of the Lombard Chamber of Commerce and currently leads the Village of Lombard's Economic and Community Development Committee. In this capacity, Mr. McNicholas works with village residents to expand existing businesses, while also recruiting new businesses to the area. Recently, the addition of Mariano's grocery store on Roosevelt Road is already proving its value to the community.

It is clear that the Village of Lombard is important to Mr. McNicholas, however, his passion for community service is not limited to Lombard. In addition to his work for the Village of Lombard, Mr. McNicholas leads the village's Rotary Club International Service Committee and assists those suffering from natural disasters. After the 2010 Haiti Earthquake, McNicholas joined with other committee members to successfully implement water service projects throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker and Distinguished Colleagues, please join me in congratulating Mr. Dennis McNicholas on being named the Village of Lombard's Senior Man of the Year for 2017.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to S. 139, FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S265–S313

Measures Introduced: Six bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2319–2324, and S. Res. 374–375. **Page S300**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 2070, to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, and to promote initiatives that will reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism. (S. Rept. No. 115–200) **Page S298**

Measures Passed:

Enrollment Correction: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 98, directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139. **Page S270**

Congratulating the University of Alabama Crimson Tide: Senate agreed to S. Res. 375, congratulating the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team for winning the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship. **Page S277**

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1519, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. **Page S270**

House Messages:

FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act: By 65 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 12), Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to 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, after taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S268–70**

Rejected:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1870 (to the House Amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date. (Senate tabled the motion to concur.) **Pages S268–70**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

McConnell Amendment No. 1871 (to Amendment No. 1870), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1870 (to the House Amendment to the bill) (listed above) was tabled. **Pages S268–70**

Further Continuing Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S305–08**

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. **Page S305**

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1903 (to the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date. **Page S305**

McConnell Amendment No. 1904 (to Amendment No. 1903), of a perfecting nature. **Page S305**

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1905, to change the enactment date. **Page S305**

McConnell Amendment No. 1906 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 1905), of a perfecting nature. **Page S305**

McConnell Amendment No. 1907 (to Amendment No. 1906), of a perfecting nature. **Page S305**

A motion was entered to close further debate on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Saturday, January 20, 2018. **Page S305**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 97 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 13), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the House message to accompany the bill. **Pages S304–05**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill at approximately 11 a.m., on Friday, January 19, 2018. **Page S308**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Kenneth Steven Barbic, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Thomas E. Ayres, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

James N. Stewart, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

John F. Ring, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2022.

Michael Stoker, of California, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

Francis R. Fannon, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Energy Resources).

Johnathan Miller, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Jackie Wolcott, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the rank of Ambassador.

Jackie Wolcott, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Vienna Office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

29 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

4 Army nominations in the rank of general.

3 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

4 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S308–13**

Messages from the House: **Page S298**

Measures Referred: **Page S298**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S298–S300**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S300–01**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S301–02**

Additional Statements: **Page S298**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S302–03**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S303**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—13) **Pages S270, S304–05**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 10:15 p.m., until 11 a.m. on Friday, January 19, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S308.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Michael D. Griffin, of Alabama, to be Under Secretary for Research and Engineering, Phyllis L. Bayer, of Mississippi, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and John Henderson, of South Dakota, who was introduced by Senator Rounds, and William Roper, of Georgia, each to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, all of the Department of Defense, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

CFIUS REFORM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States reform, focusing on examining the essential elements, including S. 2098, to modernize and strengthen the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to more effectively guard against the risk to the national security of the United States posed by certain types of foreign investment, S.

1983, to establish a process to review foreign investment to determine the economic effect of the investment on the United States, S. 1591, to impose sanctions with respect to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, after receiving testimony from Senator Cornyn; Christopher Padilla, IBM Corporation, Armonk, New York; Scott Kupor, Andreessen Horowitz, Menlo Park, California, on behalf of the National Venture Capital Association; Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Peterson Institute for International Economics, Washington, D.C.; and James Mulvenon, SOS International, Burke, Virginia.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Leon A. Westmoreland, of Georgia, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, Barry Lee Myers, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Diana Furchtgott-Roth, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, Brendan Carr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, James Bridenstine, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Commissioner, and to be Chairman, and Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner, both of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Melissa F. Burnison, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs), and Anne Marie White, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary (Environmental Management), both of the Department of Energy, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Samuel Dale Brownback, of Kansas, to be Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, Richard Grenell, of California, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, Yleem D. S. Poblete, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Verification and Compliance), James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg, Joel Danies, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, Carlos Trujillo, of Florida, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, and routine lists in the Foreign Service, all of the Department of State.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on financial aid simplification and transparency, after receiving testimony from Matthew M. Chingos, Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.; Joanna K. Darcus, National Consumer Law Center, Boston, Massachusetts; Susan Dynarski, University of Michigan Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, Ann Arbor; Laura Keane, uAspire, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Russell Lowery-Hart, Amarillo College, Amarillo, Texas.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Mitchell Zais, of South Carolina, to be Deputy Secretary, Kenneth L. Marcus, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, and James Blew, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, all of the Department of Education, Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary, Scott A. Mugno, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary, Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, all of the Department of Labor, Brett Giroir, of Texas, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, and to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, Barbara Stewart, of Illinois, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

Also, Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Children and Families: Senators Paul (Chair), Murkowski, Burr, Cassidy, Young, Hatch, Roberts, Casey, Sanders, Bennet, Kaine, Hassan, and Smith.

Subcommittee on Employment and Workplace Safety: Senators Isakson (Chair), Roberts, Scott, Burr, Paul, Cassidy, Young, Baldwin, Casey, Murphy, Warren, Smith, and Jones.

Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security: Senators Enzi (Chair), Burr, Collins, Cassidy, Young, Hatch, Roberts, Scott, Murkowski, Sanders, Bennet, Baldwin, Murphy, Warren, Kaine, Hassan, and Jones.

Senators Alexander and Murray are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, 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, 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, John H. Durham, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut, Michael T. Baylous, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of West Virginia, and Daniel R. McKittrick, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Mississippi, all of the Department of Justice.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 4819–4843; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 699–704, were introduced. **Pages H551–53**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H554–55**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Estes to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H479**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:40 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H490**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H490, H539**

Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 694, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4712) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 30, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 29. **Pages H494–H503, H512–13**

Recess: The House recessed at 6:06 p.m. and reconvened at 7 p.m. **Page H536**

Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act: The House passed H.R. 2954, to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, by a yea-and-nay vote of 243 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 32. **Pages H513–21, H536–37**

Rejected the Ellison motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 191 yeas to 236 nays, Roll No. 31. **Pages H520–21, H536–37**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee

on Financial Services now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–518, shall be considered as adopted.

Page H513

H. Res. 693, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3326) and (H.R. 2954) was agreed to yesterday, January 17th.

Federal Register Printing Savings Act: The House agreed to the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–55, by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 197 nays, Roll No. 33.

Pages H521–36, H537–38

H. Res. 696, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 195) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 194 nays, Roll No. 28, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 27. **Pages H503–12**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Wednesday, January 17th.

Global Health Innovation Act: H.R. 1660, to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 423 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 34. **Pages H538–39**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H503.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Eight yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H511, H511–12, H512, H513, H536, H537, H537–38, and H538. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Committee Meetings

SURFACE WARFARE: AT A CROSSROADS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness; and Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a joint hearing entitled "Surface Warfare: At a Crossroads". Testimony was heard from Admiral John M. Richardson, Chief of Naval Operations; and Richard V. Spencer, Secretary of the Navy.

DISRUPTER SERIES: THE INTERNET OF THINGS, MANUFACTURING AND INNOVATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection held a hearing entitled "Disrupter Series: The Internet of Things, Manufacturing and Innovation". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MODERNIZING THE SUPERFUND CLEANUP PROGRAM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled "Modernizing the Superfund Cleanup Program". Testimony was heard from Barry Breen, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Land and Emergency Management, Environmental Protection Agency; James McKenna, Portland Harbor Policy Analyst, Governor's Natural Resources Office, Oregon; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 1264, the "Community Financial Institution Exemption Act"; H.R. 1426, the "Federal Savings Association Charter Flexibility Act of 2017"; H.R. 2226, the "Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act"; H.R. 2255, the "Housing Opportunities Made Easier Act"; H.R. 2319, the "Consumer Financial Choice and Capital Markets Protection Act of 2017"; H.R. 3746, the "Business of Insurance Regulatory Reform Act of 2017"; H.R. 4061, the "Financial Stability Oversight Council Improvement Act of 2017"; H.R. 4566, the "Alleviating Stress Test Burdens to Help Investors Act"; H.R. 4607, the "Comprehensive Regulatory Review Act"; H.R. 4725, the "Community Bank Reporting Relief Act"; H.R. 4738, the "Mutual Fund Litigation Reform Act"; H.R. 4768, the "National Strategy for Combating the Financing of Transnational Criminal Organizations Act"; H.R. 4771, the "Small Bank Holding Company Relief Act of 2018"; H.R. 4785, the "American Customer Information Protection Act"; and H.R. 4792, the "Small Business Access to Capital After a Natural Disaster Act". H.R. 4768, H.R. 1264, H.R. 2226, H.R. 2319, and H.R. 4566 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 1426, H.R. 2255, H.R. 3746, H.R. 4607, H.R. 4725, H.R. 4771, H.R. 4061, H.R. 4738, H.R. 4785, and H.R. 4792 were ordered reported, without amendment.

COMBATING TRANSNATIONAL GANGS THROUGH INFORMATION SHARING

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''Combating Transnational Gangs Through Information Sharing''. Testimony was heard from Stephen E. Richardson, Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation; Raymond Villaneuva, Assistant Director in Charge, International Operations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; and Richard Glenn, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Narcotics, Department of State.

INNOVATION AT TSA: EXAMINING THREAT MITIGATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITIONS REFORM

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security held a hearing entitled ''Innovation at TSA: Examining Threat Mitigation Through Technology Acquisitions Reform''. Testimony was heard from David P. Pekoske, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security held business meeting on requesting a DHS Departmental Report on the Beneficiary of H.R. 1237. The request of a DHS Departmental Report on the Beneficiary of H.R. 1237 was approved.

EXAMINING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S ACTIONS TO ELIMINATE ONSHORE ENERGY BURDENS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Department of the Interior's Actions to Eliminate Onshore Energy Burdens''. Testimony was heard from Brian Steed, Deputy Director, Programs and Policy, Bureau of Land Management; Kevin T. Van Tassell, Senator, District 26, Utah; and public witnesses.

ARTICLE I: EFFECTIVE OVERSIGHT AND THE POWER OF THE PURSE

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Article I: Effective Oversight and the Power of the Purse'' [ORIGINAL JURISDICTION HEARING]. Testimony was heard from James Bass, Executive Director, Department of Transportation, Texas; and public witnesses.–

ENGAGING ENERGY: SMALL BUSINESS RESOURCES AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy, and Trade held a hearing entitled ''Engaging Energy: Small Business Resources at the Department of Energy''. Testimony was heard from Charles R. Smith, Director, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, Department of Energy.

AMERICA'S WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE: APPROACHES TO ENHANCED PROJECT DELIVERY

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled ''America's Water Resources Infrastructure: Approaches to Enhanced Project Delivery''. Testimony was heard from Major General Donald E. Jackson, Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; James C. Dalton, Director of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Nicole T. Carter, Specialist in Natural Resources Policy, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

ADDRESSING VETERAN HOMELESSNESS: CURRENT POSITION; FUTURE COURSE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health; and Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a joint hearing entitled ''Addressing Veteran Homelessness: Current Position; Future Course''. Testimony was heard from Matt Miller, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Veterans' Employment and Training Service, Department of Labor; Dominique Blom, General Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development; Thomas Lynch, M.D., Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Clinical Operations, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a business meeting on the public release of two executive session Committee transcripts. The public release of two executive session Committee transcripts was approved. This meeting was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMBATING TRANSNATIONAL GANGS THROUGH INFORMATION SHARING

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''Combating Transnational Gangs Through Information Sharing''. Testimony was heard from Stephen E. Richardson, Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation; Raymond Villaneuva, Assistant Director in Charge, International Operations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; and Richard Glenn, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Narcotics, Department of State.

INNOVATION AT TSA: EXAMINING THREAT MITIGATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITIONS REFORM

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security held a hearing entitled ''Innovation at TSA: Examining Threat Mitigation Through Technology Acquisitions Reform''. Testimony was heard from David P. Pekoske, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security held business meeting on requesting a DHS Departmental Report on the Beneficiary of H.R. 1237. The request of a DHS Departmental Report on the Beneficiary of H.R. 1237 was approved.

EXAMINING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S ACTIONS TO ELIMINATE ONSHORE ENERGY BURDENS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Department of the Interior's Actions to Eliminate Onshore Energy Burdens''. Testimony was heard from Brian Steed, Deputy Director, Programs And Policy, Bureau of Land Management; Kevin T. Van Tassell, Senator, District 26, Utah; and public witnesses.

ARTICLE I: EFFECTIVE OVERSIGHT AND THE POWER OF THE PURSE

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Article I: Effective Oversight and the Power of the Purse'' [ORIGINAL JURISDICTION HEARING]. Testimony was heard from James Bass, Executive Director, Department of Transportation, Texas; and public witnesses.

ENGAGING ENERGY: SMALL BUSINESS RESOURCES AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy, and Trade held a hearing entitled ''Engaging Energy: Small Business Resources at the Department of Energy''. Testimony was heard from Charles R. Smith, Director, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, Department of Energy.

AMERICA'S WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE: APPROACHES TO ENHANCED PROJECT DELIVERY

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled ''America's Water Resources Infrastructure: Approaches to Enhanced Project Delivery''. Testimony was heard from Major General Donald E. Jackson, Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; James C. Dalton, Director of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Nicole T. Carter, Specialist in Natural Resources Policy, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

ADDRESSING VETERAN HOMELESSNESS: CURRENT POSITION; FUTURE COURSE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health; and Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a joint hearing entitled ''Addressing Veteran Homelessness: Current Position; Future Course''. Testimony was heard from Matt Miller, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Veterans' Employment and Training Service, Department of Labor; Dominique Blom, General Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development; Thomas Lynch, M.D., Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Clinical Operations, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a business meeting on the public release of two executive session Committee transcripts. The public release of two executive session Committee transcripts was approved. This meeting was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D40)*

H.R. 518, to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to exclude power supply circuits, drivers, and devices designed to be connected to, and power, light-emitting diodes or organic light-emitting diodes providing illumination from energy conservation standards for external power supplies. Signed on January 12, 2018. (Public Law 115–115)

H.R. 954, to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia. Signed on January 12, 2018. (Public Law 115–116)

H.R. 2611, to modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site. Signed on January 12, 2018. (Public Law 115–117)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Safety of the U.S. Food Supply: Continuing Concerns Over the Food and Drug Administration's Food-Recall Process'', 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled ''Legislation Addressing LNG Exports and PURPA Modernization'', 9:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled ''Deficiencies in the Permitting Process for Offshore Seismic Research'', 9 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Friday, January 19

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 195, Further Continuing Appropriations Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, January 19

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Complete consideration of H.R. 4712—Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Banks, Jim, Ind., E65
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga, E62
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E57
Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E63
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E62
Cook, Paul, Calif., E58, E61
Esty, Elizabeth H., Conn., E57
Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E64
Holding, George, N.C., E60
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E59, E61, E63
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E57, E60
Langevin, James R., R.I., E59
Lieu, Ted, Calif., E60
Long, Billy, Mo., E66
McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E65
McClintock, Tom, Calif., E59
Poe, Ted, Tex., E62, E65
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E58
Renacci, James B., Ohio, E67
Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E57, E66, E67
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E61
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E66
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E65
Shimkus, John, Ill., E58
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E60, E61
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E58, E58

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.