



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2017

No. 160

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Reverend Timothy Kesicki, Jesuit Conference, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

God of all consolation, from whom human sadness is never hidden, we turn to You to be our strength this day.

The psalmist proclaims that You are close to the brokenhearted and that You save those crushed in spirit.

We pray that You lift the spirit of our Nation this day, and guide those who represent and lead Your people.

Help our leaders to find good counsel and give ear to Your holy words. The Book of Proverbs teaches us that: "For lack of counsel a nation fails, security lies with many advisers."

May all who advise, guide, and help to direct our government do so with selfless care. May they put the needs of others before their own cares and lift the burden of those who suffer most.

Grant our leaders discerning minds and hearts, so that "Your will be done" today and every day with which You bless us.

We pray this with great faith and hope.

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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. 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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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 California (Mr. PETERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PETERS 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING PERRY TECHNICAL INSTITUTE AND TYLER ANDRINGA

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Perry Technical Institute for receiving the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges' 2017 School of Excellence Award.

Perry Tech has continually provided high-quality education and technical training for students in the Yakima Valley of central Washington, and this award is well deserved.

On top of that, I would like to recognize Tyler Andringa, who received the commission's 2017 Outstanding Graduate Award. Tyler graduated from

Perry Tech in December 2016 with a certificate in information technology and communication systems.

Tyler has cerebral palsy and has overcome many challenges to obtain his certificate. He has served as a role model and a leader among his classmates.

Applying the resources and guidance he received at Perry Tech, Tyler is currently employed with Continuant, a telecommunications service provider, where he is succeeding in advancing his career goals. His achievements are commendable, and I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

Please join me in congratulating Perry Technical Institute on their achievements as they continue to provide excellent education and job training to equip students just like Tyler Andringa.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, our tax system is broken and in desperate need of reform. We need a simpler Tax Code that is fiscally responsible, makes American businesses more competitive, and allows working families to prosper in a 21st century economy.

But the Ryan-McConnell tax proposal would do the opposite and fails on the promises made by President Trump to boost the middle class. Middle class families would see an average tax increase of \$1,290 per year. That is a 380 percent increase for an average family of four.

A new analysis from the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center said that the Ryan-McConnell proposal would add \$5.6 trillion to the national debt, a 27 percent increase from the current debt which is already too high.

Under this proposal, the increased deficits will far outweigh the benefits

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7845

of reductions, and economic growth and hardworking Americans will both suffer.

Instead, we need forward-looking policies that are fiscally responsible and create opportunities for families and businesses in today's economy. That will only come from bipartisan negotiations where we can work together to create the best possible tax conditions for Americans.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FARM TO SCHOOL MONTH

(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, October is National Farm to School Month. It is time when we celebrate food education, school gardens, and lunch trays filled with healthy, local ingredients.

Farm to School brings healthy foods from local farms to schoolchildren nationwide. The program teaches students about the path from farm to fork and instills healthy eating habits that can last a lifetime by introducing children to real food.

At the same time, use of local produce in school meals and educational activities provides a new direct market opportunity for family farmers in the area and lessens environmental impacts of transporting food long distances.

More than 31 million children eat a school lunch 5 days a week, 180 days a year. If school lunch can taste great and support the local community, everybody wins. In the early 1990s, there were merely a few Farm to School programs, and today there are thousands.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, it is encouraging to see this program grow and our schoolchildren's diets improving. A lifelong love of healthy, locally grown food from your local farmer is something we can all support.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, 585, the number of people murdered and injured in Las Vegas on Sunday during the deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history.

477, the number of days since the previous deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history in Orlando.

521, the number of mass shootings since Orlando.

91, the average number of Americans killed by gun violence every day.

69, the number of homicides in Charlotte in 2017.

Zero, the number of actions taken by Congress to address the gun violence epidemic in our country.

When is enough enough? What is it going to take for Congress to end gun violence?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stop wasting time and demand that a joint select committee be established to combat gun violence and the bipartisan King-Thompson bill be brought to the floor for a vote.

It is time that we had the moral courage to act. Our Nation can't wait, and they shouldn't.

RECOGNIZING BRETT RUBIN OF BUCKS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a brave young man in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Brett Rubin.

A resident of Northampton, Brett's positive attitude and boundless energy make him a promising young leader in our community. This is even more notable due to the challenges Brett faces from type 1 diabetes. Despite these obstacles, Brett has never allowed this illness to define him or hold him back.

More amazing, Mr. Speaker, is that Brett has channeled his desire to cure this illness and to help others. Partnering with the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, Brett and his mother, Sandy, have raised thousands of dollars to combat type 1 diabetes. Participating in foundation walks, the Rubins join a close-knit group of family and friends, and they call themselves Brett's Band, which is a fitting name honoring a teenager who marches to his own beat and steals the show wherever he goes.

It is my honor to recognize this exemplary young man. I know Brett's future will be bright and that type 1 diabetes will never interfere with his ambitions or his aspirations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Pursuant to House Resolution 553 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 71.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 0911

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-339 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the house of representatives.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement in the House of Representatives

Sec. 301. Point of order against increasing long-term direct spending.
Sec. 302. Allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.
Sec. 303. Limitation on changes in certain mandatory programs.
Sec. 304. GAO report.
Sec. 305. Estimates of debt service costs.
Sec. 306. Fair-value credit estimates.
Sec. 307. Estimates of major direct spending legislation.

Sec. 308. Estimates of macroeconomic effects of major legislation.

Sec. 309. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.

Sec. 310. Limitation on advance appropriations.

Sec. 311. Scoring rule for Energy Savings Performance Contracts.

Sec. 312. Estimates of land conveyances.

Sec. 313. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.

Sec. 314. Prohibition on the use of guarantee fees as an offset.

Sec. 315. Prohibition on use of Federal Reserve surpluses as an offset.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 321. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.

Sec. 322. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 323. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.

Sec. 324. Adjustments to reflect updated budgetary estimates.

Sec. 325. Adjustment for certain emergency designations.

Sec. 326. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 401. Reserve fund for the repeal of the 2010 health care laws.

- Sec. 402. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for additional measures relating to the replacement of Obamacare.
- Sec. 403. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the 2010 health care laws.
- Sec. 404. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.
- Sec. 405. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.
- Sec. 406. Reserve fund for revenue measures.
- Sec. 407. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for infrastructure reform.
- Sec. 408. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.
- Sec. 409. Implementation of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement.
- Sec. 410. Deficit-neutral reserve account for reforming SNAP.
- Sec. 411. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Social Security Disability Insurance Reform.
- Sec. 412. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Federal retirement reform.
- Sec. 413. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for defense sequester replacement.
- Sec. 414. Reserve fund for commercialization of air traffic control.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS

- Sec. 501. Policy statement on Obamacare repeal.
- Sec. 502. Policy statement on replacing Obamacare.
- Sec. 503. Policy statement on Medicare.
- Sec. 504. Policy statement on Medicaid State flexibility block grants.
- Sec. 505. Policy statement on Social Security.
- Sec. 506. Policy statement on means-tested welfare programs.
- Sec. 507. Policy statement on reform of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.
- Sec. 508. Policy statement on work requirements.
- Sec. 509. Policy statement on a carbon tax.
- Sec. 510. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.
- Sec. 511. Policy statement on tax reform.
- Sec. 512. Policy statement on trade.
- Sec. 513. Policy statement on energy production.
- Sec. 514. Policy statement on Federal regulatory budgeting and reform.
- Sec. 515. Policy statement on Federal funding of abortion.
- Sec. 516. Policy statement on transportation reform.
- Sec. 517. Policy statement on the Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 518. Policy statement on reducing unnecessary, wasteful, and unauthorized spending.
- Sec. 519. Policy statement on a balanced budget amendment.
- Sec. 520. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
- Sec. 521. Policy statement on reforming the congressional budget process.
- Sec. 522. Policy statement on Federal accounting.
- Sec. 523. Policy statement on agency fees and spending.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,668,877,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,756,890,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,850,457,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,947,616,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,079,775,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,210,906,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,349,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,502,499,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,672,058,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,842,299,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: -\$64,692,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$76,618,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$100,119,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$112,295,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$103,141,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$107,010,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$113,215,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$119,679,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$117,320,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$116,088,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,869,547,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,894,948,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,895,989,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,925,467,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,056,667,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,054,334,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,152,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,296,588,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,397,043,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,451,336,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,809,440,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,876,701,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,881,466,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,955,056,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,056,336,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,039,746,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,124,286,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,264,841,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,380,506,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,435,219,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$140,563,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$119,811,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$31,009,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$7,440,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$23,439,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$171,160,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$224,927,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$237,658,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$291,552,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$407,080,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$20,705,790,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,342,481,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$21,881,784,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,365,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$22,732,612,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$22,971,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$ 23,180,660,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$23,283,603,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$23,324,552,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$23,082,487,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,046,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,593,666,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,095,547,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,568,776,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$16,984,250,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$17,277,258,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$17,552,761,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$17,774,272,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$17,922,572,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$17,943,641,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**
 Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$676,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$652,657,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$676,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$651,644,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$676,460,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$650,005,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$674,719,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$647,508,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$673,902,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$660,780,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$688,039,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$673,944,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$702,217,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$684,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$716,434,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$703,603,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$732,456,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$719,347,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$747,635,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$734,397,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**
 Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,236,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,568,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,103,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,517,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,810,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,508,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,469,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,270,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,485,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,068,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,881,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,222,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,885,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,636,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,669,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,168,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,148,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**
 Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,308,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,519,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,775,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,977,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,253,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,986,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,767,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,304,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,709,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,844,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,141,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,393,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,567,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,979,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,573,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,549,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,172,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,041,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$8,602,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,530,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,244,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,977,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$16,964,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$17,686,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,169,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,702,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,537,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,190,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,421,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,716,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,734,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,847,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$5,297,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,261,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,080,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,096,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,103,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,023,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,767,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,952,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,537,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,056,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,593,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,854,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,691,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,651,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,868,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,566,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,593,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,211,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,062,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,672,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,353,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,908,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,671,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,184,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,910,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,423,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,107,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,344,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,013,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,632,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,313,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,276,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,084,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,061,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,335,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,157,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,647,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,077,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,817,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,397,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,139,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,702,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$8,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,020,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$9,217,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,316,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,865,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,514,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$15,782,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$25,946,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$14,917,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,024,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$14,287,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,184,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,818,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,083,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,941,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,606,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$27,462,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$13,895,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$28,552,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$83,577,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,088,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,185,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,804,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,240,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,577,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,883,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,156,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,185,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,040,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,708,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,337,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,885,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,366,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,337,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,198,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,014,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,275,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,020,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,058,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,715,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,206,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,562,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,197,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,232,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,282,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,337,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,275,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,463,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,278,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,336,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,239,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,903,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,454,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,945,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,158,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,683,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,256,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,598,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,825,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,530,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,483,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,228,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,941,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,665,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,334,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,210,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,170,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,141,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,302,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,344,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$454,509,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$432,501,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$435,341,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$439,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$457,516,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$448,856,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$450,448,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$455,861,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$456,758,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$461,189,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$465,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$466,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$473,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$471,674,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$479,987,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$476,960,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$484,487,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$481,009,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$483,275,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$485,571,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$591,229,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$590,967,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$650,283,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$650,040,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$674,221,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$674,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$707,798,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$707,601,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$778,613,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$778,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$774,353,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$774,163,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$774,204,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$774,007,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$842,125,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$841,909,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$924,327,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$924,102,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$989,487,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$989,265,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$472,681,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$458,878,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$427,283,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$418,415,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$433,650,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$424,439,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$438,723,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$430,323,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$442,003,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$439,172,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$421,768,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$415,075,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$428,653,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$417,101,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$434,146,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$423,466,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$441,856,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$436,970,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$448,955,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$443,434,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,475,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,475,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,016,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,016,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,287,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,287,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,748,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,392,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,378,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,378,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,764,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,764,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,388,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$66,388,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,871,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,871,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,473,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,473,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$178,038,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,507,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$190,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$194,930,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$193,931,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,751,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$197,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$215,442,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$213,337,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$212,567,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$210,444,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$209,943,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$207,908,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$227,991,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$225,820,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$234,947,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$232,660,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,718,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$241,501,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,987,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,438,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,597,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,054,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,361,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,354,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,249,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,365,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,203,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,908,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,705,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,488,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,252,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,105,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,669,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,048,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,333,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,351,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,818,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,757,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,972,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,497,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,346,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,159,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,959,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,817,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,488,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,594,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,325,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,274,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,140,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,930,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,796,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,518,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,942,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$373,956,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$373,956,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$399,575,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$399,575,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$432,397,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$432,397,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$464,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$464,410,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$492,279,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$492,279,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$516,440,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$516,440,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$532,410,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$532,410,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$544,916,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$544,916,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$555,256,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$555,256,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$554,858,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$554,969,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$103,895,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$139,536,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$122,471,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$113,004,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$192,059,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$164,127,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$192,585,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$160,271,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$213,001,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$185,944,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$239,872,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$219,297,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$186,688,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$167,764,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$165,184,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$150,710,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$201,905,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$176,558,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$237,951,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$216,002,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$83,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$83,212,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$86,409,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$86,409,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$86,316,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$86,316,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,347,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,347,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, -\$93,573,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$93,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$100,001,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$100,001,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$105,371,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$105,371,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$115,139,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$115,139,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$117,033,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$117,033,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$127,808,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$127,808,000,000.
 (2) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Not later than 90 days after the adoption of this resolution, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations on changes in laws within their jurisdictions to the Committee on the Budget that would achieve the specified reduction in the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$327,704,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$32,601,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$441,015,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$2,665,188,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall sub-

mit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$154,083,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$24,689,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$67,178,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$59,302,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(9) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$447,960,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(10) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$5,561,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(11) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$49,022,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(12) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,417,836,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may file appropriately revised allocations, aggregates, and functional levels upon the consideration of a reconciliation measure under section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report to the House of Representatives pursuant to this section, if it is in compliance with the reconciliation directives by virtue of section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) REVISION.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be the allocations and aggregates established by this concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(d) PURPOSE OF RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS.—It is the policy of this resolution that the reconciliation instructions provided pursuant to this section are to be used for—

- (1) enacting the mandatory spending reforms recommended by this resolution; and
- (2) enacting comprehensive tax reform.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement in the House of Representatives

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of whether a measure would cause a net increase in direct spending in the House of Representatives, in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in

any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods beginning with the first fiscal year that is 10 fiscal years after the budget year provided for in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget in the House of Representatives, for each bill or joint resolution other than an appropriation measure and any amendment thereto or conference report thereon.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods described in subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION.—In the House of Representatives, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any bills or joint resolutions, or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget has made adjustments to the allocations, levels, or limits contained in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 401.

(d) DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in direct spending shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 302. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—In the House of Representatives, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, which shall be deemed to be an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 302(a)(3) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(b) 302 ALLOCATIONS.—The separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) shall be the exclusive allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under such section 302(b).

(c) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the "first fiscal year" and the "total of fiscal years" shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2018. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(d) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays shall only be counted toward the allocation referred to in subsection (a) if designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2018, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(f) ADJUSTMENTS TO FUND OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels related to Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism or the allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations set forth in the report or joint explanatory

statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution to account for new information.

SEC. 303. LIMITATION ON CHANGES IN CERTAIN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “change in mandatory programs” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A provision in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year that proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such change in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3), shall not be in order in the House of Representatives.

(2) **AMENDMENTS AND CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an amendment to, or a conference report on, a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year if such amendment thereto or conference report thereon proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such change in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3).

(3) **AMOUNT.**—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

(A) for fiscal year 2018, \$17,000,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2019, \$15,000,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2020, \$13,000,000,000.

(c) **DETERMINATION.**—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 304. GAO REPORT.

(a) **GAO SUBMISSION.**—At a date specified by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, the Comptroller General, in consultation with the chair, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall submit to the chair a comprehensive list of all current direct spending programs of the Government.

(b) **PUBLICATION.**—The chair of the Committee on the Budget shall cause to be printed in the Congressional Record the list submitted under subsection (a). The chair shall publish such list on the Committee’s public Web site. Such publication shall be searchable, sortable, and downloadable.

SEC. 305. ESTIMATES OF DEBT SERVICE COSTS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may direct the Congressional Budget Office to include in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any bill or joint resolution, or an estimate of an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, an estimate of any change in debt service costs (if any) resulting from carrying out such bill or resolution. Any estimate of debt servicing costs provided under this section shall be advisory and shall not be used for purposes of enforce-

ment of such Act, the Rules of the House of Representatives, or this concurrent resolution. This section shall not apply to authorizations of discretionary programs or to appropriation measures, but shall apply to changes in the authorization level of appropriated entitlements.

SEC. 306. FAIR-VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) **ALL CREDIT PROGRAMS.**—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate of any measure that establishes or modifies any program providing loans or loan guarantees, the Director shall, to the extent practicable, provide a supplemental fair-value estimate of any loan or loan guarantee program if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

(b) **STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide a supplemental fair-value estimate as part of any estimate for any measure establishing or modifying a program providing loans or loan guarantees for student financial assistance or housing (including residential mortgage).

(c) **BASELINE ESTIMATES.**—The Congressional Budget Office shall include estimates, on a fair-value and credit reform basis, of loan and loan guarantee programs for student financial assistance, housing (including residential mortgage), and such other major loan and loan guarantee programs, as practicable, in its *Budget and Economic Outlook: 2018 to 2027*.

SEC. 307. ESTIMATES OF MAJOR DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.

The Congressional Budget Office shall prepare, to the extent practicable, an estimate of the outlay changes during the second and third decade of enactment for any direct spending legislative provision—

(1) that proposes a change or changes to law that the Congressional Budget Office determines has an outlay impact in excess of 0.25 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States during the first decade or in the tenth year; or

(2) for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives requests such an estimate.

SEC. 308. ESTIMATES OF MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION.

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 114th and 115th Congresses, any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act for major legislation considered in the House of Representatives shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Con-

gressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives for all direct spending and revenue legislation; or

(ii) the Member who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 309. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—In the House of Representatives, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto is offered or any conference report thereon is submitted, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2018 and the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust the applicable levels in this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 310. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, except as provided for in subsection (b), any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide advance appropriations.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report or the joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading—

(1) **GENERAL.**—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(2) **VETERANS.**—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) **GENERAL.**—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(2) VETERANS.—\$70,699,313,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2018.

SEC. 311. SCORING RULE FOR ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall estimate provisions of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon that affects the use of any covered energy savings contract on a net present value basis.

(b) NPV CALCULATIONS.—The net present value of any covered energy savings contract shall be calculated as follows:

(1) The discount rate shall reflect market risk.

(2) The cash flows shall include, whether classified as mandatory or discretionary, payments to contractors under the terms of their contracts, payments to contractors for other services, and direct savings in energy and energy-related costs.

(3) The stream of payments shall cover the period covered by the contracts but not to exceed 25 years.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term “covered energy savings contract” means—

(1) an energy savings performance contract authorized under section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act; or

(2) a utility energy service contract, as described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Federal use of energy savings performance contracting, dated July 25, 1998 (M-98-13), and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal use of energy saving performance contracts and utility energy service contracts, dated September 28, 2012 (M-12-21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House of Representatives, if any present value calculated under subsection (b) results in a net savings, then such savings may not be used as an offset for purposes of budget enforcement.

(e) CLASSIFICATION OF SPENDING.—For purposes of budget enforcement, the estimated net present value of the budget authority provided by the measure, and outlays flowing therefrom, shall be classified as direct spending.

(f) SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, should separately identify the cash flows under subsection (b)(2) and include such information in the President’s annual budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the scoring method used in this section should not be used to score any contracts other than covered energy savings contracts.

SEC. 312. ESTIMATES OF LAND CONVEYANCES.

In the House of Representatives, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall include in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any measure that conveys Federal land to any non-Federal entity—

(1) the methodology used to calculate such estimate;

(2) a detailed justification of its estimate of any change in revenue, offsetting receipts,

or offsetting collections resulting from such conveyance;

(3) if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget, any information provided by the Bureau of Land Management or other applicable Federal agency, including the source and date of such information, that supports the estimate of any change in revenue, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections;

(4) a description of any efforts to independently verify such agency estimate; and

(5) a statement of the assumptions underlying the estimate of the budgetary effects that would be generated by such parcel in CBO’s baseline projections as of the most recent publication or update.

SEC. 313. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

In the House of Representatives, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 314. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that increases, or extends the increase of, any guarantee fees of the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 315. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers any portion of the net surplus of the Federal Reserve System to the general fund of the Treasury shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 321. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 322. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—In the House of Representatives, any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(d) AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 301 of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 323. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions in accordance with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 324. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT UPDATED BUDGETARY ESTIMATES.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect any adjustments to the baseline made by the Congressional Budget Office.

SEC. 325. ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that designates an emergency under section 4(g)(2) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

SEC. 326. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House of Representatives adopts the provisions of this title, title II, and title VII—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary

effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that only consists of a full repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

SEC. 402. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL MEASURES RELATING TO THE REPLACEMENT OF OBAMACARE.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals or replaces provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 403. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 404. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 when the macroeconomic effects of such reforms are taken into account.

SEC. 405. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that such chair determines are necessary to implement a trade agreement, and the budgetary levels for any companion measure that offsets such trade measure, if the combined cost of each measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 406. RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue.

SEC. 407. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INFRASTRUCTURE REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolu-

tion, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms the Federal infrastructure funding system, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 408. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 409. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution to accommodate the enactment of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement if it includes permanent spending reductions and reforms to direct spending program, and does not increase outlays in any fiscal year.

SEC. 410. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE ACCOUNT FOR REFORMING SNAP.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP), but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 411. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms the Social Security Disability Insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 412. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 413. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit re-

forms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 414. RESERVE FUND FOR COMMERCIALIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust, at a time the chair deems appropriate, the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and other applicable committees of the House of Representatives, aggregates, and other appropriate levels established in this concurrent resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system if such measure reduces the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 by the amount that would otherwise be appropriated to the Federal Aviation Administration for air traffic control. Adjustments to the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, consistent with the adjustments to the discretionary spending limits under such section 251(c), shall only be made upon enactment of such measure.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, a measure that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system shall be a measure that establishes a federally chartered, not-for-profit corporation that—

- (1) is authorized to provide air traffic control services within the United States airspace;
- (2) sets user fees to finance its operations;
- (3) may borrow from private capital markets to finance improvements;
- (4) is governed by a board of directors composed of a CEO and directors whose fiduciary duty is to the entity; and
- (5) becomes the employer of those employees directly connected to providing air traffic control services and who the Secretary transfers from the Federal Government.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON OBAMACARE REPEAL.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152) should be repealed.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPLACING OBAMACARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Obamacare put Washington's priorities before those of patients'. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised. Instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family's health care premiums were supposed to decline by \$2,500; instead, average premiums have increased 105 percent. A study conducted by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated premiums to continue rising over the next decade, projecting an average increase of 8 percent per year between 2016 and 2018, and increasing by nearly 60 percent by 2026.

(2) President Obama pledged, "If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan." Instead, CBO now estimated 7 million Americans will lose employment-based health coverage due to the health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House Pelosi stated that the President's health care law

would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, CBO estimated that by 2025 Obamacare will reduce the number of hours worked by approximately 2 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. Additionally, a study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimated that Obamacare will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) Since the ACA was signed into law, the Obama administration repeatedly failed to implement it as written. President Obama's unilateral actions resulted in numerous changes, delays, and exemptions. President Obama signed into law another 24 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual "mandate" could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional; and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees even if it violates the companies' religious beliefs. More than 7 years after enactment, the courts continue to evaluate the legality of how President Obama's administration implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly of the underlying law; health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(5) Obamacare is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. Its complex structure of subsidies, mandates, and penalties perversely impact individuals, married couples, and families. Those who previously had insurance along with those who did not have been funneled into a new system that is providing less access to doctors and treatments. Millions of Americans have been added to a broken Medicaid system that is incapable of providing the care promised. Cuts made to Medicare to fund a new entitlement are undermining the health security of seniors. Taxes and mandates are distorting the insurance market and harming the broader economy, resulting in fewer jobs and less opportunity. By design, Obamacare put Washington at the center of our health care system, at the expense of patients, families, physicians, and businesses. The ACA should be fully repealed, allowing for real patient-centered health care reform that puts patients first, not Washington.

(b) **POLICY ON REPLACING OBAMACARE.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Obamacare must not only be repealed, but also replaced by enacting the American Health Care Reform Act.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2028 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries; and

(D) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without

adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in or near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits due to the program's impending bankruptcy, and instead offer beneficiaries more options, better care, with reduced costs for both beneficiaries and the Federal Government, by modernizing Medicare.

(c) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Medicare is preserved for current and future beneficiaries.

(2) Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs.

(3) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as an option.

(4) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(5) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

(6) The Medicare eligibility age is gradually increased to keep pace with increases in longevity.

(7) Medicare is simplified by combining parts A and B and reforms to Medigap plans are implemented.

SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAID STATE FLEXIBILITY BLOCK GRANTS.

It is the policy of this resolution that Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) should be block granted to the States in a manner prescribed by the State Health Flexibility Act.

SEC. 505. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the "three-legged stool" of retirement security, which includes employer provided benefits as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2022, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2034, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2034, benefits will be cut nearly 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The Disability Insurance program provides an income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. However, the program is in serious financial trouble. The number of beneficiaries has skyrocketed from 2.7 million in 1970 to 10.6 million in 2016. At the same time, the labor force participation rate has now fallen to the lowest levels since the 1970s. As a result, the Social Security Actuary now projects that the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be depleted in 2023.

(4) If this program is not reformed, families who rely on the lifeline that disability

benefits provide will face benefit cuts of up to 11 percent in 2023, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(5) Americans deserve action by the President, the House, and the Senate to preserve and strengthen Social Security. It is critical that action be taken to address the looming insolvency of Social Security.

(b) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work to make Social Security sustainably solvent. This resolution assumes these reforms will include the following policies, based upon the Social Security Reform Act:

(1) Adoption of a more accurate measure for calculating cost of living adjustments.

(2) Adoption of adjustments to the full retirement age to reflect longevity.

(3) Makes Social Security benefits more progressive over the long term, providing those most in need with a safety net in retirement.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes that reforms to the Disability Insurance program will include—

(1) encouraging work;

(2) updates of the eligibility rules;

(3) reducing fraud and abuse;

(4) enactment of H.R. 2031, the Social Security Disability Insurance and Unemployment Benefits Double Dip Elimination Act, to prohibit individuals from drawing benefits from both programs at the same time; and

(5) enactment of H.R. 1540, the Social Security Disability Insurance Return to Work Act, to allow the award of time-limited benefits for applicants whose medical recovery is anticipated in order to create new opportunities for beneficiaries.

SEC. 506. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that:

(1) Too many people are trapped at the bottom rungs of the economic ladder, and every citizen should have the opportunity to rise, escape from poverty, and achieve their own potential.

(2) In 1996, President Bill Clinton and congressional Republicans enacted reforms that have moved families off of Federal programs and enabled them to provide for themselves.

(3) Today, there are approximately 92 Federal programs on which Government at the Federal and State level spend more than \$1 trillion annually that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

(4) It should be the goal of welfare programs to encourage work and put people on a path to self-reliance.

(b) **POLICY ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.**—It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the welfare system should be reformed to give states flexibility to implement and improve safety net programs and that to be eligible for benefits, able bodied adults without dependents should be required to work or be preparing for work, including enrolling in educational or job training programs, contributing community service, or participating in a supervised job search; and

(2) the President's budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

SEC. 507. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORM OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) SNAP.—It is the policy of the resolution that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program be reformed so that:

(1) Nutrition assistance funds should be distributed to the states as a block grant with funding subject to the annual discretionary appropriations process.

(2) Funds from the grant must be used by the states to establish and maintain a work activation program for able-bodied adults without dependents.

(3) It is the goal of this proposal to move those in need off of the assistance rolls and back into the workforce and towards self-sufficiency.

(b) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes that, pending the enactment of reforms described in (a), the conversion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs.

SEC. 508. POLICY STATEMENT ON WORK REQUIREMENTS.

It is the policy of this resolution that all means-tested welfare programs should include work activation requirements for able-bodied adults.

SEC. 509. POLICY STATEMENT ON A CARBON TAX.

It is the policy of this resolution that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

SEC. 510. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Across the Nation, too many Americans are struggling to make ends meet. The slowly falling unemployment rate has masked an underlying crisis as millions of Americans have abandoned the work force and wages have stagnated. The labor force participation rate has plummeted to levels not seen since the Carter presidency.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 1.9 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country's fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while government spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher.

(4) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country's economic outlook. Investors and businesses make decisions on a forward-looking basis. They know that today's large debt levels are simply tomorrow's tax hikes, interest rate increases, or inflation and they act accordingly. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(5) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels) is a net positive for economic growth over time.

(6) If the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a "crowding out" of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country's standard of living.

(7) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(8) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by \$273 billion.

(9) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(b) POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustainable path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty holding back job creators. Reforms to the tax code will put American businesses and workers in a better position to compete and thrive in the 21st century global economy. This resolution targets the regulatory red tape and cronyism that stack the deck in favor of special interests. All of the reforms in this resolution serve as means to the larger end of helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

SEC. 511. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A reformed tax code should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all 3 counts: it is complex, unfair, and inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) High marginal tax rates lessen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation.

(3) The United States corporate income tax rate is the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages, discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(4) The "world-wide" structure of United States international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors that have more competitive international tax systems.

(5) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, consumers in higher prices, and investors in diminished returns.

(6) Closing tax loopholes to finance higher spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(7) Tax reform should curb or eliminate loopholes and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board, not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(8) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform, including a broader tax base and lower tax rates, would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which would have a positive impact on total national output.

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform that is revenue-neutral on a dynamic basis that provides for the following:

(1) Targets revenue neutrality based on a dynamic score that takes into account the macroeconomic effects of reform.

(2) Collapses the current seven brackets for individuals into just three, with a top rate of no more than 33 percent.

(3) Simplifies the tax code to ensure that fewer Americans will be required to itemize deductions.

(4) Gives equal tax treatment to individual and employer healthcare expenditures modeled on the American Health Care Reform Act.

(5) Encourages charitable giving.

(6) Repeals the Death Tax.

(7) Eliminates marriage penalties.

(8) Provides tax-free universal savings accounts to reward saving.

(9) Repeals the alternative minimum tax.

(10) Reduces double taxation by lowering the top corporate rate to no more than 20 percent.

(11) Reduces the rate for capital gains and dividends.

(12) Encourages net investment, savings, and entrepreneurial activity, including full expensing.

(13) Moves to a competitive territorial system of international taxation.

(14) Ends distortionary special interest giveaways, such as the Wind Production Tax Credit.

SEC. 512. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers.

(2) The United States can increase economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services.

(3) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass international competition.

(b) POLICY ON TRADE.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution—

(1) to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive tax system to promote domestic job creation;

(2) that the United States should continue to seek increased economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through high-standard trade agreements that satisfy negotiating objectives, including—

(A) the expansion of trade opportunities;

(B) adherence to trade agreements and rules by the United States and its trading partners, and

(C) the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services by opening new markets and enforcing United States rights; and

(3) that any trade agreement entered into on behalf of the United States should reflect the negotiating objectives and adhere to the provisions requiring improved consultation with Congress.

SEC. 513. POLICY STATEMENT ON ENERGY PRODUCTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and currently unavailable areas of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) should be open for energy exploration and production.

SEC. 514. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Excessive Federal regulation—

(A) has hurt job creation, investment, wages, competition, and economic growth, slowing the Nation's recovery from the economic recession and harming American households;

(B) operates as a regressive tax on poor and lower-income households;

(C) displaces workers into long-term unemployment or lower-paying jobs;

(D) adversely affects small businesses, the primary source of new jobs; and

(E) impedes economic growth.

(2) Federal agencies routinely fail to identify and eliminate, minimize, or mitigate excess regulatory costs through post-implementation assessments of their regulations.

(3) The United States Code of Federal Regulations now contains over 185,000 pages of regulations in 242 volumes.

(4) Notwithstanding the size and growth of Federal regulations, Congress lacks an effective mechanism to manage the level of new Federal regulatory costs imposed each year. Other nations, meanwhile, have successfully implemented the use of regulatory budgeting to control excess regulation and regulatory costs.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act has resulted in more than 177.9 million annual hours of regulatory compliance paperwork, \$37.1 billion of regulatory compliance costs on the private sector, and \$13 billion in regulatory compliance costs on the States.

(6) Agencies impose costly regulations without relying on sound science through the use of judicial consent decrees and settlement agreements and the abuse of interim compliance costs imposed on regulated entities that bring legal challenges against newly promulgated regulations.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with the public, consider legislation that—

(1) promotes—

(A) economic growth, job creation, higher wages, and increased investment by eliminating unnecessary red tape and streamlining, simplifying and lowering the costs of Federal regulations; and

(B) the adoption of least-cost regulatory alternatives to meet the objectives of Federal regulatory statutes;

(2) protects—

(A) the poor and lower-income households from the regressive effects of excessive regulation; and

(B) workers against the unnecessary elimination of jobs and loss or reduction of wages;

(3) requires—

(A) an annual, congressional regulatory budget that establishes annual costs of regulations and allocates these costs amongst Federal regulatory agencies;

(B) cost-benefit and regulatory impact analysis for new regulations proposed and promulgated by all Federal regulatory agencies;

(C) advance notice of proposed rulemaking and makes evidentiary hearings available for critical disputed issues in the development of new major regulations; and

(D) congressional approval of all new major regulations before the regulations can become effective, ensuring that Congress can better prevent the imposition of unsound costly new regulations;

(4) reduces—

(A) regulatory barriers to entry into markets and other regulatory impediments to competition and innovation; and

(B) the imposition of new Federal regulation that duplicates, overlaps or conflicts with State, local, and Tribal regulation or that impose unfunded mandates on State, local, and Tribal governments; and

(5) eliminates the abuse of guidance to evade legal requirements applicable to the development and promulgation of new regulations.

SEC. 515. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer dollars shall go to any entity that provides abortion services.

SEC. 516. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRANSPORTATION REFORM.

It is the policy of this resolution that State and local officials are in a much better position to understand the needs of local commuters, not bureaucrats in Washington. Federal funding for transportation should be phased down and limited to core Federal duties, including the interstate highway system, transportation infrastructure on Federal land, responding to emergencies, and research. As the level of Federal responsibility for transportation is reduced, Congress should also concurrently reduce the Federal gas tax.

SEC. 517. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care.

(2) In 2015, for the first time, VA health care was added to Government Accountability Office's (GAO) "high-risk" list, due to mismanagement and oversight failures, which have resulted in untimely and inefficient health care. According to GAO, "the absence of care and delays in providing care have harmed veterans."

(3) The VA's failure to provide timely and accessible health care to our veterans is unacceptable. While Congress has done its part for more than a decade by providing sufficient funding for the VA, the administration has mismanaged these resources, resulting in proven adverse effects on veterans and their families.

(b) **POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs continue its oversight efforts to ensure the VA reassesses its core mission, including—

(A) reducing the number of bureaucratic layers;

(B) reducing the number of senior and middle managers;

(C) improving performance measure metrics;

(D) strengthening the administration and oversight of contractors; and

(E) supporting opportunities for veterans to pursue other viable options for their health care needs; and

(2) the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on the Budget should continue to closely monitor the VA's progress to ensure VA resources are sufficient and efficiently provided to veterans.

SEC. 518. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (GAO) is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs could "lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings."

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017, the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs.

(4) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$137 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2015.

(5) Under clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120-day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(6) Clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the House of Representatives prohibits an appropriation for an expenditure not previously authorized by law. Despite this longstanding prohibition, more than \$310 billion has been appropriated for unauthorized programs in fiscal year 2016, spanning 256 separate laws.

(7) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) **POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees' judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House rules.

SEC. 519. POLICY STATEMENT ON A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government will collect approximately \$3.4 trillion in taxes, but spend nearly \$4 trillion to maintain its operations, borrowing 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) As of March 16, 2017, the national debt of the United States was nearly \$20 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Government to hold a constitutional convention to adopt a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

(4) Forty nine States have fiscal limitations in their State constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) Five States, including Arizona, Georgia, Alaska, Mississippi, and North Dakota, have agreed to the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which is seeking to amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget through an Article V convention by April 12, 2021.

(b) **POLICY ON A BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress should propose a balanced budget constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

SEC. 520. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies held \$921 billion in unobligated balances at the end of fiscal year 2017.

(2) These funds comprise both discretionary appropriations and authorizations of mandatory spending that remain available for expenditure.

(3) In many cases, agencies are provided appropriations that remain indefinitely available for obligation.

(4) The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an Act of Congress.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed;

(2) the appropriate committees in the House should identify and review accounts with unobligated balances and rescind such balances that would not impede or disrupt the fulfillment of important Federal commitments;

(3) the House, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and appropriate agencies, should continue to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction; and

(4) unobligated balances in dormant accounts should not be used to finance increases in spending.

SEC. 521. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Enactment of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 was the first step toward restoring constitutionally endowed legislative responsibility over fundamental budget decision making.

(2) However, the congressional budget process has neither constrained spending nor inhibited the expansion of Government. The growth of the Government, primarily through a multiplicity of mandatory programs and other forms of direct spending, has largely been financed through borrowing and high tax rates.

(3) The enforcement of the current budget process, including congressional points of order and statutory spending limits, have been too often waived or circumvented. This contributes to a lack of accountability, which has led to broad agreement that reforming the system is a high necessity.

(b) **POLICY ON REFORMING THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress should—

(1) restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) reassert congressional power over spending and revenue, restore the balance of power between Congress and the President as the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 intended, and attain the maximum level of accountability for budget decisions through efficient and rigorous enforcement of budget rules;

(3) improve incentives for lawmakers to budget as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially by adopting an annual budget resolution;

(4) encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending;

(5) revise the methodology used in developing the baseline, which is intended to reflect an objective projection of the budgetary effects of current laws and policies for future fiscal years, by removing any tendency toward assuming higher spending levels;

(6) promote efficient and timely budget actions to ensure lawmakers complete their

budget actions before the start of the new fiscal year;

(7) provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts economic growth and job creation; and

(8) eliminate the complexity of the budget process and the biases that favor higher spending.

(c) **LEGISLATION.**—The Committee on the Budget of the House should draft legislation during the 115th Congress that rewrites the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers' dollars are spent wisely and efficiently. Such legislation shall—

(1) attain greater simplicity without sacrificing the rigor required to address—

(A) the complex issues of the domestic and world economy;

(B) national security responsibilities; and

(C) the appropriate roles of rulemaking and statutory enforcement mechanisms;

(2) establish a new structure that assures the congressional role in the budget process is applied consistently without reliance on reactive legislating;

(3) improve the elements of the current budget process that have fulfilled the original purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(4) rebuild the foundation of the budget process to provide a solid basis from which additional reforms may be developed.

SEC. 522. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Current accounting methods fail to capture and present in a compelling manner the full scope of the Government and its fiscal situation.

(2) Most fiscal analyses produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) are conducted over a 10-year time horizon. The use of generational accounting or a longer time horizon would provide a more complete picture of the Government's fiscal situation.

(3) The Federal budget currently accounts for most programs on a cash accounting basis, which records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received. However, it accounts for loan and loan guarantee programs on an accrual basis, which records revenue when earned and expenses when incurred.

(4) The Government Accountability Office has advised that accrual accounting may provide a more accurate estimate of the Government's liabilities than cash accounting for some programs, specifically insurance programs.

(5) Accrual accounting under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA) understates the risk and thus the true cost of some Federal programs, including loans and loan guarantees.

(6) Fair value accounting better reflects the risk associated with Federal loan and loan guarantee programs by using a market based discount rate. CBO, for example, uses fair value accounting to measure the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

(7) In comparing fair value accounting to FCRA, CBO has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of Federal assistance".

(8) This concurrent resolution directs CBO to estimate the costs of credit programs on a fair value basis to fully capture the risk associated with Federal credit programs.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with CBO and other appropriate stakeholders, reform government-wide budget and accounting practices so Members and the public can better understand the fiscal situation of the United States and the options best suited to improving it.

SEC. 523. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget to be \$513 billion in fiscal year 2017.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable government.

(b) **POLICY ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present the Republican Study Committee's 2018 budget, Securing America's Future Economy.

This proposal combines savings that have been proposed by the Congressional Budget Office, many RSC members, and public policy think tanks, including The Heritage Foundation, Citizens Against Government Waste, and the National Taxpayers Union. It is based on a simple principle that government should spend its money as carefully as families spend what they have left after they have paid their taxes.

By restraining the growth of spending and refocusing resources on core government responsibilities, adopting commonsense reforms, and placing Medicare and Social Security back on sound financial footing, we believe there is still time to save this country from financial and economic ruin. But time is running out.

On our current course, the Congressional Budget Office warns that, within 4 years, our deficits will balloon to \$1 trillion annually, adding about \$8,000 a year to an average family's debt that they will have to pay off in future taxes. Two years after that, interest on

the national debt will reach \$654 billion. That is more than we currently spend for the entire defense establishment.

Let me repeat that so it sinks in. Six years from now, we will spend more than our current defense budget accomplishing nothing but renting the money that we have already borrowed and spent. Three years later, Medicare will collapse. Six years after that—if we get that far—Social Security runs out of money.

This approaching crisis can be described with just three numbers: 26, 35, and 49. Once you understand those three numbers—26, 35, and 49—you can plainly see the root of our problems.

Twenty-six percent is the combined population and inflation growth over the past 10 years. Thirty-five percent is the growth in Federal revenues. Clearly, this is not a revenue problem. The problem is that third number. Forty-nine percent is the growth in spending—nearly twice the rate of inflation and population combined.

We are about to hear about the draconian cuts from the opposition. Let me emphasize, the RSC budget continues to grow the Federal Government every year. I repeat, the RSC budget spends more every year.

Over the decade, we have provided for more than \$1 trillion of government growth. Only in Washington can that be described as a cut. The RSC budget merely restrains the growth of spending over the next decade to give families the time and room to catch up.

□ 0915

By doing so, we can arrest the ruinous spiral of debt and interest costs that now threaten the very solvency of our Nation.

This budget gores a lot of sacred cows, because we want to point out the wide range of savings available to achieve. But I would ask the opponents of this budget to consider one thing as we race toward the looming fiscal crisis just 4 years down the road: you cannot provide for the common defense or general welfare or do all of the other things our government is called upon to do if you cannot pay for them. Our mountainous debt, driven by out-of-control spending, now threatens our ability to do so.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to cut to the chase: the Republican Study Committee budget is so extreme, it cannot be taken seriously. It cuts spending by \$10 trillion over 10 years, which is \$4 trillion more than the already irresponsible spending cuts in Chairman BLACK's budget.

To its credit, the RSC tells us where those cuts will come from, rather than leaving large amounts unspecified or using matching asterisks or phony economic assumptions to reduce spending.

The RSC budget cuts Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. It cuts programs that ensure basic living standards, protect the environment, and help families afford college.

For 2018, the RSC budget matches the President's level for defense, including war funding. But for nondefense discretionary spending, the RSC budget provides \$394 billion, which is \$122 billion, or 24 percent, below the austerity cap.

There is no way this House or any House would approve an appropriations bill that inflicted a 24 percent cut on all government operations. If just two programs—veterans' programs and NIH funding—were excluded from those cuts, everything else would be cut by more than 55 percent.

So yes, this budget claims to reach balance, but it would achieve it by making cuts that would be catastrophic. Not even Congress is that self-destructive.

I contend that the two Republican budgets actually show how dismissing the notion that revenues must be a part of any solution to restrain deficits and debt, compounded with the flawed notion that balance must be achieved in the short term, will inflict intolerable hardship on the American people.

While totally unintentional, they make a pretty compelling case that for Congress to responsibly address our debts and deficits, while funding the Federal programs and investments that the American people want and expect, raising revenues has to be part of the equation.

One of the things that amuses me, in a very kind of dark way, is that I remember so well, in 2010, when Republicans actually rode to victory in the House by claiming that we Democrats were going to cut \$750 billion out of Medicare. That wasn't true, but they claimed it.

Now, in this Republican Study Committee budget, they have doubled down on that. It is not exactly double, but they are going to cut it by \$898 billion. I don't think America's seniors and the disabled population would feel very good about that.

I would like to thank my colleagues for bringing that important issue to the debate.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, \$20.2 trillion. Our national debt is more than \$20.2 trillion.

Let's put it this way: each American's share of the national debt is \$62,000. From the retiree in North Carolina who has already done so much to serve the country, to the newborn child

in New York with so much potential, that is \$62,000. In fact, it is more than the median American family brings home in an entire year.

Our debt continues to mount, even as Federal reserves reach record highs. This leads to an undeniable conclusion, even from Captain Obvious: the Federal Government has a spending problem.

The growing Federal Government has significant negative consequences for the country and its people. The large Federal debt reduces investment, productivity, and wages, while Federal interventions in the economy reduce the incentive to work, resulting in a shrinking labor market.

The debt can have dangerous implications for our national security, recently causing a bipartisan group of leading national security officials to write that "our long-term debt is the single greatest threat to our national security."

Most fundamentally, when the Federal Government is too big and too intrusive, it interferes with our unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Eleven months ago, the American people voted to give Republicans unified control of government. Now it is time to follow through and implement the policy agenda that Congress and the President were elected on.

As the calendar moves into fall, the grade of the 115th Congress will be delivered on whether we can reform our inefficient Tax Code. This process starts with the budget. Along with repealing ObamaCare and securing our border, the Republican Study Committee budget allows us to fulfill these promises, and more.

This fiscal year 2018 RSC budget ensures a strong national security, robust economic growth, equal opportunity for all, a sustainable social safety net, and a return to constitutionally limited government, all with a goal of securing America's future economy.

Instead of a future of high debt and low growth, the RSC budget proposes a positive blueprint for success and opportunity. Our budget focuses on progrowth, profamily policies that will boost America's economy and provide a strong fiscal foundation for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to thank my friend, Mr. McCLINTOCK, for his leadership of the RSC budget task force, as well as all the members of the Republican Study Committee who participated in this effort.

With this budget, we have accomplished our goals of detailing the variety of bold policy solutions, as well as helping to influence the balanced budget offered by my friend, Chairman BLACK, to include meaningful, enforceable, reconciliation targets, as the RSC budget does, so that we can begin the essential task of implementing these policies into law.

My fellow Members, when will our debt matter? Next year? The year after?

In 6 years, we are projected to spend more than \$650 billion on interest alone on our debt.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WALKER. What will it take for our friends on the left to stop hijacking the American Dream for our children and grandchildren? Is it not a moral injustice to leave this level of debt to the next generation?

Mr. Chairman, we have been making this argument in the House for years. Today, it is time to make a difference.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is fascinating to have this debate and speaking in such high-principled ways about the need to reduce deficits and debt. I don't think any Democrat would argue that we need to do something to reduce deficits and debt. We face a very dire, long-term fiscal future.

But we also lose sight of the fact that the American people expect something from their government. They expect our government to keep them safe, but they also expect their government to protect their drinking water, protect their air, to make sure that the food they eat is not dangerous, to provide law enforcement and help local law enforcement to do many things.

The budget, as well as Chairman BLACK's committee budget, would decimate all of those services that the American people expect from the Federal Government.

I think only about what is going on right now with Houston, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and the enormous cost that the Federal Government is going to have to bear to help restore those communities and those territories to some degree of normalcy. That is what they expect the American Government to do. These budgets would make that all but impossible.

So we look at it both ways. Later, we will propose a Democratic alternative that actually makes those kind of investments and makes sure that the notion of American security is not just a huge military, but is a foundation of investment in human capital and research and infrastructure that will allow this economy to grow. We do it with keeping debt at the same percentage of the economy, as it is now, because we are willing to raise revenues.

On the other hand, Republican budgets, both the Republican Study Committee budget and the chairman's budget, anticipate enormous tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and corporations—tax cuts that have been proven to do exactly the opposite of what many on the other side claim they do, which is to stimulate economic growth.

We will hear claims that, yes, we can cut taxes by \$2 trillion or \$3 trillion

over 10 years, and they are going to be paid for by this renewal of economic activity. But history tells us that is not what happens. Not only history tells us that, but virtually all the economists in the country tell us that, too.

Goldman Sachs, Steve Mnuchin's previous employer, says that the tax cuts outlined last week would maybe create an additional 0.2 percent of growth in the economy.

CBO and the Federal Reserve say tax cuts don't pay for themselves. Even Bruce Bartlett, the author of "Reagonomics," says this whole notion that tax cuts pay for themselves is nonsense. He actually said bull, which is half of what he said, but you get the idea.

This is not easy. We can speak in the darkest terms of how we are imposing this debt on our grandchildren and try to use emotional arguments. But the fact is, we are dealing with a very realistic, pragmatic dilemma, and that is: how to do what the American people expect us to do without making the future impossible.

It is not done by the Republican budgets. We think it is helped along by the Democratic alternative, and we look forward to having that debate just a little bit later this morning.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind my friend from Kentucky that Ronald Reagan reduced the Federal income tax rate from 70 percent down to 28 percent, and income tax revenues doubled.

He is correct that we expect things from our government. We have seen a 49 percent increase in spending in the last decade. Have we seen a 49 percent increase in the quality of education or a 49 percent increase in our infrastructure or our defense capability?

What we have seen is a 49 percent increase in bureaucracy and government.

I would remind the gentleman that when we squander the people's money, we rob them of the means to meet the disasters and unforeseen circumstances that confront our country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), my friend and former chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go off script for a little bit and echo the comments the gentleman was making.

He talked about the Reagan tax cuts and what they did to stimulate the economy and to grow tax revenues and to allow hardworking American families to keep more of their paychecks.

I would also go on to remind the gentleman from Kentucky, to disabuse him about his views of tax reform, and remind him that President John F. Kennedy, a Democrat, reduced the top marginal rates from 93 percent to 73 percent. The economy grew, more jobs

were created, and more revenue was created for the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government doesn't have a revenue problem. It has a spending problem. That is what we tackle with the Republican Study Committee budget.

I thank Mr. McCLINTOCK for his incredible and insightful leadership in generating the FY 2018 RSC budget that we are now considering.

The House Budget Committee's budget proposals continue to benefit from the framework of the RSC budget by including meaningful, enforceable reconciliation targets, as our budget does. The House budget will begin the essential task of implementing these policies into law.

Other instances where the RSC-led budget proposals have historically wound up being adopted in the larger House budget include the following:

First, balancing the budget within a 10-year budget window.

Two, including policies to ensure the solvency of entitlement programs, such as Social Security, Medicare, and also Medicaid.

Number three, providing the necessary funding and resources for a robust national security.

Number four, fully repealing ObamaCare.

Number five, establishing a pathway to progrowth tax reform that will jump-start our economy and help hardworking American families take home more of their paychecks.

I was humbled to serve as the chairman of the RSC during the 114th Congress. At that time, we generated a new budget for fiscal year 2017, called the Blueprint for a Balanced Budget 2.0. It was written and released in the spring of 2016.

Like the current RSC budget, it provided a robust agenda of conservative policies to show the American people our vision for this Nation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. In the tradition of The Heritage Foundation's 1980 mandate for leadership that provided a policy agenda for the incoming Reagan administration, our Blueprint for a Balanced Budget 2.0 for the new President and his administration set forth an agenda for governing in 2017.

□ 0930

By all accounts, the RSC budget has proven successful in achieving this goal, with President Trump basing many of the policies for his fiscal 2018 budget request on the RSC's fiscal 2017 budget.

I am pleased to see that many RSC-led proposals are included in both the President's budget and the House budget that we will consider later today.

In the coming years, I look forward to continuing to see the RSC putting forth and leading on many conservative, sound policy ideas for our budgetary process.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all our colleagues to vote “yes” on the RSC budget and to vote “yes” on the House GOP budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I feel like I have to be Paul Harvey for a second and talk about the rest of the story.

Because while what Mr. McCLINTOCK said was true about the initial phases of the Reagan administration, at the end of the Reagan administration, the national debt had almost tripled, and he had been forced to raise taxes a couple of times in the interim.

So, again, we can argue about how positive cutting taxes were in the Reagan administration, but the end result wasn't particularly good for the American economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, who wins in the Republican budget?

Same old same old; millionaires, billionaires, large corporations. The Republican budget paves the way for their plan, which gives 80 percent of its tax cuts to the top 1 percent of Americans, while 30 percent of middle class households making between \$50,000 and \$150,000 a year would actually see a tax increase. This is according to the non-partisan Tax Policy Center.

It slashes \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid, even worse than TrumpCare, and it ends the guarantee of Medicare benefits for American seniors.

It attacks women's health by defunding, of course, Planned Parenthood, once again. It slashes SNAP—SNAP, the Food Stamp program—by \$154 billion, taking nutrition assistance away from up to 7 million households.

Did you really come to Congress to take food out of the mouths of hungry children?

Now we are considering the Republican Study Committee budget, which includes even deeper cuts for children and families and seniors while giving tax cuts to the wealthy.

My Democratic colleagues and I offer A Better Deal for America. The United States is the richest country in the world at the richest time in history. We can have quality healthcare, affordable childcare, debt-free college, secure retirement, and world-class infrastructure, but not if we give massive tax cuts to the wealthiest individuals and corporations.

So I urge my colleagues to reject the RSC budget, reject the Republican budget, and to support the Democratic alternative. Americans deserve a budget that grows our middle class and invests in our future.

I want to read just one paragraph of a letter from Planned Parenthood that says: “The House Budget Resolution proposes cuts that would be disastrous for women, men, and young people Planned Parenthood sees every day. It sacrifices access to healthcare, repeal-

ing the Affordable Care Act, gutting Medicaid, and proposing even deeper cuts to low-income nondefense discretionary spending. It undermines access to critical reproductive healthcare, including no copay birth control, for millions of women.”

The women of America are watching. This budget is a particular disaster for them, for us.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, Article I, section 9 of the Constitution grants Congress the power of the purse. This assigns to Congress the role of final arbiter of the use of public funds.

Despite this clear declaration of power, the Office of Management and Budget estimates that agencies collected over \$513 billion in fines, fees, penalties, and other offsetting collections and receipts in fiscal year 2017. Allowing agencies to have slush funds outside of the normal appropriations process is a recipe for bad acting.

The RSC budget calls for implementing the Agency Accountability Act, which directs that all fines, fees, and settlements go to the Treasury, making them subject to the normal appropriations process. This would end the agencies' ability to operate independently and outside of the oversight of Congress. More importantly, it would allow Congress to fully account for how much money the government actually collects and where that money is coming from.

I am also pleased that the RSC budget does what is increasingly becoming an impossible task: it balances the budget, all while prioritizing defense spending to keep this country secure. This budget sets forth the bold ideas necessary to put the country back on a path of fiscal responsibility.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that if we stay on the current irresponsible fiscal path we are on, by 2047, in 30 years, our debt to GDP will be 150 percent. Stated more simply, our debt will be 50 percent greater than our entire gross domestic product.

We must put our Nation back on a path of fiscal responsibility, and the RSC budget does exactly that. As former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Michael Mullen warned, our national debt is the greatest threat to our national security. By putting our Nation on a sensible fiscal path of balancing the budget, we reduce the extremely heavy burden that a bloated Federal Government places on America's working families, allowing them to prosper and making the government less intrusive in their lives.

I would also like to add extemporaneously in regard to what we are doing on SNAP benefits. What we are doing is imposing work requirements on able-bodied adults with no children. I want to repeat: able-bodied adults with no children. I think most Americans would agree that if they are getting payments from the Federal Gov-

ernment, they ought to at least do some work.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to my colleagues on this budget that there are two fundamental assumptions that are being made that need to be challenged.

One, you are saying that we have a spending problem, not a revenue problem. This country is spending on domestic priorities and defense at a level that existed when the President of the United States was Dwight D. Eisenhower, and that was before Medicaid and Medicare.

We have a significant issue about how we are going to meet the needs of the people of this country, both on defense, where we need some help, but definitely on the domestic side as well.

The second assumption that you are making—and it is an assertion that is made over and over again—is that tax cuts will pay for themselves. That is the theology of your budget: tax cuts pay for themselves.

You know, why not go to zero, and we will all be rich?

That is essentially what is being said here. But the tax cuts are always at the high end of the income spectrum, which is exacerbating inequality and creating a problem for us to meet essential needs in this country.

So this question of tax cuts paying for themselves and fiscal responsibility, let's have a little bit of history here. This was the theology of George Bush when he passed the tax cuts when he became President. They did not pay for themselves. We went from the Clinton-era surpluses to the Bush-era deficits, and in another fiscally, grossly irresponsible move, he put the war on the credit card.

The war was on the credit card. We had unpaid-for tax cuts and we had an unpaid-for war. And this is not just fiscal responsibility; this is governmental, personal, congressional irresponsibility. You have got to pay for things. Whether it is the war or it is food stamps or it is any program that you want to pick, you have got to pay for it.

You don't pay for it by the magic asterisk of saying, “the tax cuts that we propose,” when we are going to spend by cutting taxes or going into a war that we don't pay for, \$1 trillion, it doesn't work. And that is why we are in this path that is very dangerous with respect to the long-term debt.

I believe in that. We have got to pay our bills. When we had the majority, we had a doctrine that said: Pay as you go.

If any Democrat, the budget chair, or me wanted to propose some spending, we either had to come up with the revenue or we had to cut somewhere else. I believe in that.

But I don't believe in unpaid-for tax cuts paying for themselves. I don't believe that more spending pays for itself

and we can just put it on the credit card.

Now, we have got some problems and challenges in this country. We have got an opportunity problem.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, kids going to school get out with a debt the size of a mortgage. We have got an inequality problem. It has never been worse. It goes back to the Great Depression, when we had this divide between what hardworking people made and what the top 1 percent made.

We have got a healthcare affordability problem, but you don't solve that by slashing access to healthcare and throwing 24 million people off of healthcare. We have got an infrastructure problem that we are totally neglecting. It is not addressed in this budget.

We have got a DREAMer problem.

How is it that, in this Congress, we are literally not allowing 800,000 young people who came here, through no fault of their own, not voluntarily, and we are going to give them the hook and deport them?

It is outrageous?

We have got a rural America problem. Rural America has been left behind. The inequality in this country is really hitting hard on rural America, in parts of Vermont, and in all parts of this country. And there is nothing in this budget that says: We are going to give hope to rural America by investing in them.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the whole House to support this Republican budget, H. Con. Res. 71.

Let me just say a few things.

First, this is a budget that reflects our first principles: freedom, freedom enterprise, a government accountable to the people it serves.

It is a budget that will help grow our economy, and it is a budget that will help rein in our debt. It strengthens our national defense. It supports our men and women in uniform. It eliminates mindless, endless spending, and it maximizes American's tax dollars. It reforms Medicaid. It strengthens Medicare.

This is a budget that keeps our responsibilities to our children and our grandchildren. Remember, we have a responsibility here, each and every generation, each and every Member: leave the country better off so your kids and your grandkids can prosper.

That American legacy is seriously at risk because of our growing deteriorating budget situation, because of the coming debt crisis. This budget tackles that.

There is one more thing that this budget does that is so important. It

paves the way for historic tax reform. It unlocks the reconciliation process. We need to pass this budget so that we can deliver real relief for middle-income families across this country. We need to pass this budget for the people who are living paycheck to paycheck in America, who are trying to juggle it all. They are looking to get under a hopelessly broken Tax Code.

We haven't reformed this tax system since 1986. We need to pass this budget so that we can help bring more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for people across this country. The time for this is now, and the opportunity is right in front of us.

I want to especially commend Chairman BLACK for her commitment to this vision. I want to especially commend the members of the Budget Committee for their steadfast commitment to this vision. We would not be in a position today to pass this budget without her tireless leadership and the leadership of her members of the committee.

It is so encouraging that the Senate has passed their budget out of committee. They are on the track, too. That means we look forward to working with the Senate to take the next step.

We have an opportunity to make right by our fellow countrymen. We have an opportunity to make right by the people we represent. We have an opportunity to actually restore prosperity in this country.

□ 0945

We haven't seen that kind of economic potential in this country in at least a decade. We can fix that this year.

We know a debt crisis is coming. We know if we do nothing, the next generation will be worse off. We can stop that, fix this, and make them better off.

That is what this budget paves the way for, and that is why I urge all of my colleagues to support this budget.

I thank the chair for her steadfast support. I thank the Members for getting us to where we are today, and I really look forward to the day where we can look at this moment as when we got the country on the right track.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just say that we need to cut right to the chase.

It is unlikely that either the Republican Study Committee budget or the Republican Budget Committee budget could pass this House. It certainly couldn't pass the Congress.

This is all about moving the ball forward so we can push through a massive tax cut to the wealthiest Americans, with 51 votes in the Senate. That is what this day is about, and that is what this process is about.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject both the Republican Study Committee budget and the Republican Budget Committee budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters of sup-

port of the Republican Study Committee budget from the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, FreedomWorks, and Heritage Action for America.

COMMITTEE FOR A RESPONSIBLE
FEDERAL BUDGET,
September 8, 2017.

Hon. MARK WALKER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALKER: I am writing you to express our appreciation for the fiscally responsible budget released by the Republican Study Committee.

Your budget would make important progress by putting debt on a downward path as a share of GDP, reducing it from 77 percent today to 56 percent by 2027—instead of letting it rise to 89 percent as under current law.

By calling for spending cuts and entitlement reforms, your budget helps to keep the national debt on a sustainable path.

We applaud the Republican Study Committee for your serious contribution to the ongoing budget debate.

Sincerely,
MAYA MACGUINEAS,
President, Committee for a Responsible
Federal Budget.

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS AGAINST
GOVERNMENT WASTE,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: You will soon vote on several different budget proposals for fiscal year (FY) 2018. On behalf of the more than one million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), I urge you to support the budget resolution as reported by the House Budget Committee and the Republican Study Committee's (RSC) budget resolution, both of which would put the nation back on the path to fiscal sanity and pave the way for comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform.

Under the leadership of Chairman Diane Black (R-Tenn.), H. Con. Res. 71, as reported by the House Budget Committee, would reduce spending by \$6.5 trillion over 10 years and balance the budget by 2027. H. Con. Res. 71 provides reconciliation instructions for fundamental tax reform that, if enacted, will allow Americans to keep more of their money, simplify the filing of taxes, and allow small businesses to boost wages and create jobs. While H. Con. Res. 71 would increase defense spending above Budget Control Act mandated cap levels, this legislation also calls for \$203 billion in spending cuts across various programs and a \$700 billion reduction in improper payments.

The RSC budget enacts many of the same reforms as the House Budget Committee's plan, but it proposes to reduce government spending by \$10 trillion over 10 years and achieves balance in six years. The RSC plan creates a pathway for tax reform; repeals and replaces Obamacare; makes Social Security solvent; rescues Medicare and disability insurance; and decreases FY 2018 non-discretionary spending to \$394 billion.

Tax reform presents an historic opportunity to unleash the economic potential of the American people. While Congress is well-positioned to enact tax reform, that cannot occur until a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions is adopted. I urge

you to support both the House Budget Committee's FY 2018 budget resolution as reported and the RSC's FY 2018 budget resolution. All votes on the FY 2018 budget resolutions will be among those considered in CCAGW's 2017 Congressional Ratings.

Sincerely,

TOM SCHATZ,
President, CCAGW.

[From FreedomWorks, Oct. 4, 2017]

KEY VOTE YES ON THE MCCLINTOCK
AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 71

On behalf of FreedomWorks' activist community, I urge you to contact your representative and ask him or her to vote YES on the amendment offered by Rep. Tom McClintock (R-Calif.) to H. Con. Res. 71, the budget resolution for FY 2018. The amendment, which includes reconciliation instructions for fundamental tax reform, is the Republican Study Committee's FY 2018 budget alternative.

The Republican Study Committee's (RSC) FY 2018 budget would reduce federal spending by more than \$10 trillion over the ten-year budget window, bringing the budget into balance in FY 2023. The RSC's budget would repeal ObamaCare and enact other patient-centered health insurance reforms, make Social Security and Medicare solvent, and reform federal welfare programs. It also promotes free trade, regulatory reform, and other free market, limited government principles.

The current text of H. Con. Res. 71 and the McClintock amendment include language that allows the House Ways and Means Committee to produce legislation to reform the tax code. Riddled with loopholes and special interest deductions, America's tax code has become far too complex. According to the Tax Foundation, Americans spent 8.9 billion hours and \$409 billion complying with the more than 74,000-page tax code.

It has been more than 30 years since Congress passed fundamental tax reform. Congress has a generational opportunity to reform the tax code by consolidating and lowering tax rates, broadening the tax base, and promoting job creation and international competitiveness for American businesses. This will make the tax code fairer and simplify the filing process, allowing the vast majority of Americans to file their taxes on a postcard.

FreedomWorks will count the vote on the McClintock amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 on our 2017 Congressional Scorecard. The scorecard is used to determine eligibility for the FreedomFighter Award, which recognizes Members of the House and Senate who consistently vote to support economic freedom and individual liberty.

Sincerely,

ADAM BRANDON,
President, FreedomWorks.

[From Heritage Action for America, Oct. 3, 2017]

“YES” ON THE RSC’S BUDGET: SECURING
AMERICA’S FUTURE ECONOMY

(By Andrea Palermo)

On Thursday, the House will vote on the Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) Budget offered by the Republican Study Committee (RSC) as an amendment to the committee-approved FY18 budget resolution. The RSC's Budget: Securing America's Future Economy, introduced by RSC Budget and Spending Task Force Chairman Tom McClintock (R-Calif.), would balance in 2023, reduce non-defense discretionary spending, reestablish national defense spending to support the military, break the “firewall” between defense and non-defense discretionary spending, fully repeal

and replace Obamacare, repeal Dodd-Frank by implementing the Financial CHOICE Act, reform entitlement programs, and finally, enact pro-growth tax reform. If passed, the RSC's budget would give lawmakers a serious conservative blueprint for reform.

Pro-Growth Tax Reform. Republicans campaigned and promised to fix America's broken tax code. The current code has become a significant obstacle to economic growth, job creation and higher wages for American workers. The RSC budget would fulfill the Republican campaign promise by enacting tax reform that cuts taxes for families, makes American businesses competitive around the globe, ends double taxation, and simplifies the code.

Repealing Obamacare. Republicans owe their majorities to their unwavering opposition to Obamacare, a reality that is reflected in the RSC's budget. The budget remains committed to fully repealing the law despite recent Republican failures, and sends a signal to the American people that conservatives will continue to push for free-market, patient-centered health care reforms.

Funding Defense. Although the Budget Control Act of 2011 has put significant pressure on our military, a conservative budget would align military spending with strategic priorities by breaking the firewall. The RSC's budget does not rely on the much-discussed OCO gimmick, but increases defense spending to a total of \$668 billion in FY18, which is \$119 billion above the current defense cap. Importantly, that cost is offset by lowering non-defense discretionary spending to \$394 billion in FY18, which is \$122 billion below the cap.

Reforming Entitlements. The RSC's budget maintains the Medicare premium support reforms, which are widely established and broadly supported. In addition, the budget lays down bold markers on Social Security, Social Security Disability Insurance and Medicaid. It takes a similarly aggressive approach on mandatory program spending like food stamps (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) by building on the success of the 1996 welfare reforms and enacting work requirements as outlined in the Welfare Reform and Upward Mobility Act (H.R. 2832/S. 1290) and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Reform Act (H.R. 2996).

Other important items in the budget include: Enacting the Financial CHOICE Act, eliminating the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), holding federal agencies accountable, reducing funding for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), separating food stamps and farm programs, ending commodity subsidy programs, reforming crop insurance, ending unconstitutional amnesty for illegal immigrants, enforcing existing immigration laws, securing our borders, delegating elementary and secondary education to states and localities modeled after the Academic Partnership Leads us to Success (A-PLUS) Act, reforming Higher Education by passing the Higher Education Reform and Opportunity (HERO) Act, eliminating Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, returning transportation and infrastructure policy to the states, reorganizing the executive branch, and protecting the life of the unborn.

Taken as a whole, the RSC's “Securing America's Future Economy” demonstrates a seriousness of purpose when it comes to governing. If passed, this budget would provide a fiscally responsible path forward for our nation, limit the size and scope of our bloated federal government, and unleash economic prosperity for all Americans.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, Just a few steps from this Hall, Thom-

as Jefferson addressed his first inaugural address. After listing all of the blessings that our country enjoys, he asked what more do we need to maintain a happy and prosperous society. He said: “Still one thing more, fellow citizens. A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government. . . .”

We have it within our power to restore that wise and frugal government and the prosperity and happiness that free societies always produce the moment we summon the political will to do so. The Republican Study Committee seeks that shining city on a hill and today offers this map to get us there.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 281, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

AYES—139

Abraham	Gosar	Mullin
Allen	Gowdy	Newhouse
Amash	Graves (GA)	Norman
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Olson
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Babin	Grothman	Perry
Banks (IN)	Guthrie	Pittenger
Barr	Handel	Poe (TX)
Barton	Harper	Posey
Bergman	Harris	Ratcliffe
Biggs	Hensarling	Renacci
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Rohrabacher
Black	Hill	Rokita
Blackburn	Holding	Rooney, Francis
Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Rooney, Thomas
Brat	Hudson	J.
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Ross
Buck	Hultgren	Rouzer
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Sanford
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
Byrne	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Shimkus
Coffman	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Cole	Labrador	Smith (NE)
Collins (GA)	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Comer	LaMalfa	Smucker
Conaway	Lamborn	Stewart
Culberson	Latta	Taylor
Davidson	Lewis (MN)	Tipton
DesJarlais	Long	Walberg
Dunn	Loudermilk	Walker
Emmer	Love	Walorski
Estes (KS)	Marchant	Walters, Mimi
Farenthold	Massie	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McClintock	Webstrup
Flores	McHenry	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Williams
Gaetz	Rodgers	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Meadows	Woodall
Gibbs	Messer	Yoder
Gohmert	Mitchell	Yoho
Goodlatte	Moolenaar	Zeldin

NOES—281

Adams	Gallego	Norcross
Aderholt	Garamendi	Nunes
Aguilar	Gianforte	O'Halleran
Bacon	Gomez	O'Rourke
Barletta	Gonzalez (TX)	Palazzo
Barragan	Gottheimer	Pallone
Bass	Granger	Panetta
Beatty	Green, Al	Pascarell
Bera	Green, Gene	Paulsen
Beyer	Griffith	Payne
Bilirakis	Grijalva	Pearce
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Blum	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hartzler	Peters
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Peterson
Bonamici	Heck	Pingree
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins (NY)	Poliquin
	Himes	Polis
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brooks (IN)	Huffman	Quigley
Brown (MD)	Hunter	Raskin
Brownley (CA)	Hurd	Reed
Buchanan	Issa	Reichert
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jayapal	Richmond
Capuano	Jeffries	Roby
Carbajal	Jenkins (WV)	Roe (TN)
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Carter (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Cartwright	Jones	Roskam
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rothfus
Castro (TX)	Katko	Royce (CA)
Cheney	Keating	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kennedy	Rush
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Russell
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Rutherford
Clay	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kind	Sánchez
Clyburn	King (IA)	Schakowsky
Cohen	King (NY)	Schiff
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Schneider
Comstock	Knight	Schrader
Cannolly	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Cook	Lance	Serrano
Cooper	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costello (PA)	Lawrence	Shuster
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Simpson
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crawford	Levin	Sires
Crist	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cummings	LoBiondo	Soto
Curbelo (FL)	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Stefanik
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Lowe y	Suo zzi
DeFazio	Lucas	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Luetkemeyer	Takano
Delaney	Lujan Grisham,	Tenney
DeLauro	M.	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Demings	Lynch	Thompson (PA)
Denham	MacArthur	Thornberry
Dent	Maloney,	Tiberi
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Torres
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Trott
Dingell	Marshall	Tsongas
Doggett	Mast	Turner
Donovan	Matsui	Upton
Duffy	McCarthy	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	McCollum	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	McEachin	Veasey
Ellison	McGovern	Vela
Engel	McKinley	Velázquez
Eshoo	McNerney	Visclosky
Españillat	McSally	Wagner
Esty (CT)	Meehan	Walden
Evans	Meeks	Wasserman
Faso	Meng	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	Mooney (WV)	Waters, Maxine
Fortenberry	Moore	Watson Coleman
Foster	Moulton	Welch
Fox x	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Wittman
Fudge	Neal	Womack
Gabbard	Noem	Yarmuth
Gallagher	Nolan	Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—13

Bridenstine	Kihuen	Sarbanes
DeSantis	Murphy (PA)	Titus
Doyle, Michael F.	Napolitano	Waiz
Frelinghuysen	Rosen	Young (AK)
	Roybal-Allard	

□ 1011

Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina, CLEAVER, DENHAM, NORCROSS, CONYERS, CUMMINGS, RUTHERFORD, BACON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. WEBSTER of Florida, SESSIONS, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 555.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I was absent during roll call votes No. 553 through 555 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on the Grijalva of Arizona Substitute Amendment No. 1, aye on the Scott of Virginia Substitute Amendment No. 2, and no on the McClintock of California Substitute Amendment No. 3.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for struggling families.
Sec. 202. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care improvements.
Sec. 203. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for job creation through infrastructure and other investments and incentives.
Sec. 204. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for education.
Sec. 205. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and service members.
Sec. 206. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for retirement security.

Sec. 207. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence and security.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 302. Adjustments to discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 303. Costs of emergency needs, overseas contingency operations, and disaster relief.
Sec. 304. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 305. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 306. Adjustments for changes in the baseline.
Sec. 307. Reinstatement of Pay-As-You-Go.
Sec. 308. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—POLICY STATEMENTS

Sec. 401. Policy of the House on affordable health care coverage for working families.
Sec. 402. Policy of the House on tax reform that provides support and relief to hardworking American families.
Sec. 403. Policy of the House on defense and nondefense funding increases.
Sec. 404. Policy of the House on immigration reform.
Sec. 405. Policy of the House on Social Security.
Sec. 406. Policy of the House on protecting the Medicare guarantee for seniors and persons with disabilities.
Sec. 407. Policy of the House on financial stability and consumer protection.
Sec. 408. Policy of the House on women's economic empowerment.
Sec. 409. Policy of the House on national security.
Sec. 410. Policy of the House on Veterans Affairs.
Sec. 411. Policy of the House on disaster response funding.
Sec. 412. Policy of the House on the Federal workforce.
Sec. 413. Policy of the House on climate change science.
Sec. 414. Policy of the House on increased efficiency and eliminating waste.
Sec. 415. Policy of the House on the investigation of Russian interference in the 2016 U.S. presidential election.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,844,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,964,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,113,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,423,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,597,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,764,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,953,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,207,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$4,452,763,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$111,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$130,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$162,930,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$181,302,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$240,528,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$279,624,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$301,711,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$331,684,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$417,865,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$494,376,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,367,297,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,461,508,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,629,655,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,799,113,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,033,996,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,174,442,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$4,306,821,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$4,541,077,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$4,777,428,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$4,981,428,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,298,502,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,458,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,600,937,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,772,732,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,013,050,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,138,267,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$4,256,084,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$4,494,045,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$4,734,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$4,939,221,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$453,521,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$493,617,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$487,431,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$531,519,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$589,606,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$540,727,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$491,945,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$540,183,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$526,957,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$486,458,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,039,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,723,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,376,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$23,077,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,809,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$24,527,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$25,225,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$25,964,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$26,751,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$27,396,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,379,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,974,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,590,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$17,280,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$18,061,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$18,832,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$19,597,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$20,455,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$21,349,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$22,257,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$611,095,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$605,151,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$624,257,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$615,594,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$637,442,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$624,735,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$650,661,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$635,887,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$663,854,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$652,771,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$678,004,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$661,070,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$692,193,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$669,803,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$706,422,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$688,324,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$722,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$703,659,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$737,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$718,554,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,701,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,067,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,535,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,871,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,799,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,619,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,165,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,398,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,235,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,156,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,530,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,335,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,045,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,582,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,606,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,953,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,130,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,388,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,607,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,808,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,260,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,550,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,211,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,622,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,863,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,350,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,622,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,074,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,346,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,802,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,586,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,792,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,565,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,173,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,341,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,873,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,963,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,341,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,411,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,742,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,074,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,858,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,334,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,789,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,346,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,807,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,471,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,270,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,003,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,166,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,021,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,423,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,297,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,515,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,459,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,095,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,593,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,009,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,350,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,746,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,675,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,696,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,383,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,734,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,169,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,784,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,162,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,694,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,065,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,041,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,789,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,010,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,904,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,122,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,863,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,248,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,675,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,067,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,625,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,766,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,833,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,220,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,803,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,319,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,931,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,518,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,908,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,144,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,360,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,763,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,171,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,596,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,417,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,791,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,159,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,503,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,785,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,689,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,375,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,376,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,551,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,843,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,358,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,316,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,728,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,264,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,953,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,297,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,880,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,056,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,127,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,127,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$96,208,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,317,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,834,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$96,984,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,720,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,346,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,632,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$99,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$93,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$101,474,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,477,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$103,104,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$105,171,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$96,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$107,021,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$108,930,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,342,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,344,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,877,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,725,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,707,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,465,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,132,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,303,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,592,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,391,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,028,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,391,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,475,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,248,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,957,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,443,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,803,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,579,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,187,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$106,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$105,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$109,914,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$115,689,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$112,802,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,590,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$116,131,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$114,730,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$118,614,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$117,458,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$120,755,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$119,721,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$122,813,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$121,720,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,791,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$123,693,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$126,672,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$125,661,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$128,521,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$127,646,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$571,431,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$579,006,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$602,781,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$603,771,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$646,929,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$636,581,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$669,489,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$668,431,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$703,074,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$701,107,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$736,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$734,349,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$772,672,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$770,440,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$810,846,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$807,924,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$849,794,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$846,440,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$890,523,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$887,123,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$598,530,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$597,691,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$655,963,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$655,485,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$694,178,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$693,880,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$746,379,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$746,140,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$840,893,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$840,679,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$865,420,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$865,230,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$888,496,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$888,306,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$986,770,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$986,568,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,070,124,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,069,920,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,152,041,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,151,843,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$522,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$504,646,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$538,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$525,694,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$554,091,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$542,383,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$569,091,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$558,147,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$587,643,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$583,197,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$596,563,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$587,818,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$605,530,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$591,214,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$626,210,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$612,973,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$641,786,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$635,202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$658,210,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$650,880,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,801,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,644,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,342,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,283,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,606,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,055,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,047,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,680,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,686,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,643,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,653,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,003,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,016,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,598,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,614,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,052,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,069,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,625,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,642,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$177,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$178,068,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$194,339,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$191,615,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$201,128,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$198,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$207,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$205,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$223,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$221,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$221,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$219,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$218,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$216,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$236,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$234,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$243,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$241,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$252,291,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$250,117,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,627,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$68,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$71,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$80,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$80,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,878,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,958,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,624,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$376,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$376,659,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$408,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$408,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$451,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$451,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$500,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$500,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$547,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$547,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$592,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$592,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$633,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$633,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$670,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$670,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$707,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$707,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$737,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$737,707,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$22,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$12,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$17,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$12,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$15,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$12,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$13,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$10,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$11,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$8,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$6,624,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$4,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$2,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$13,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,367,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$82,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$82,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$85,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$84,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$84,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$86,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$86,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,147,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$88,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$88,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$92,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$92,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$100,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$100,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$98,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$98,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,256,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$101,256,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$76,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$41,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$19,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$7,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$3,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$1,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$64,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$30,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$16,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STRUGGLING FAMILIES.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of struggling families by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027. Improvements may include any of the following:

(1) Ensuring that all Americans have access to good-paying jobs, including funding proven, effective job training and employment programs, such as summer and year-round youth employment programs and registered apprenticeship programs, and national service opportunities.

(2) Tax reform that provides support and relief to hard-working American families, including enhancements to the Earned Income Tax Credit, the Child Tax Credit, and the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit.

(3) Expanded investments to ensure all working families have access to high-quality childcare programs.

(4) Creation of a permanent summer child nutrition Electronic Funds Transfer program to ensure children receive supplemental food benefits.

(5) Additional investment in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund beyond the base levels provided by the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac).

(6) Reauthorization of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program that ensures the continuation of successful home visiting programs and additional Federal support to serve a greater share of at-risk families.

(7) Changes to improve the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, including legislation that increases funding for the base block grant, increases access to education and training, or requires States to spend more TANF funds on the program's core purposes such as work, childcare, and assistance to struggling families.

(8) Funding for research designed to improve program effectiveness in creating positive outcomes for low-income children and families.

(9) Additional investments that end homelessness among America's families.

(10) Changes to improve support for at-risk families, reduce child abuse and neglect, or improve reunification, permanency, and post-permanency services in order to reduce the need for foster care.

(11) Changes to encourage and efficiently collect increased parental support for children, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child and policies to ensure that non-custodial parents are able to pay the child support they owe and maintain positive relationships with their children.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENTS.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) improves the affordability and quality of health care and expands coverage;

(2) improves access to and affordability of prescription drugs;

(3) improves the stability of the marketplaces for nongroup health insurance;

(4) advances biomedical research and development of more effective treatments and cures;

(5) extends expiring provisions of Medicare, Medicaid, Children's Health Insurance Program and other health programs;

(6) improves access to opioid addiction treatment and prevention programs;

(7) improves availability of long-term care services and supports for senior citizens and individuals with disabilities.

(8) improves the contemporary health care workforce's ability to meet emerging demands;

(9) improves Medicare quality, efficiency, and benefit design to make care more affordable and accessible for people with Medicare; or

(10) improves Medicaid quality, efficiency, and benefit design to make care more affordable and accessible for people with Medicaid; by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR JOB CREATION THROUGH INFRASTRUCTURE AND OTHER INVESTMENTS AND INCENTIVES.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for robust Federal investments in America's infrastructure, incentives for businesses, and support for communities or other measures that create jobs for Americans and boost the economy. Revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) provide for additional investments in highways, transit systems, bridges, rail, aviation, harbors (including harbor maintenance dredging), seaports, inland waterway systems, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other infrastructure;

(2) provide for additional investments in other areas that would help businesses and other employers create new jobs; and

(3) provide additional incentives, including tax incentives, to help small businesses, nonprofits, States, and communities expand investment, train, hire, and retain private-sector workers and public service employees; by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit

for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EDUCATION.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that supports students by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027. Support may include any of the following:

(1) Efforts to make higher education more affordable and increase college and degree completion by encouraging States and institutions of higher education to improve educational outcomes and access for low- and moderate-income students through support for campus-based aid programs; increased funding for the Pell grant program; and assistance to empower borrowers in lowering and managing their student loan debt through refinancing and expanded repayment options.

(2) Increases in funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to put the Federal Government on a 10-year path to fulfill its commitment to America's children and schools by providing 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for special education.

(3) Increases in funding to ensure access to high-quality child care and early learning programs for every child including investments in the Federal Preschool Development Grant program, Head Start program, and the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

(4) Increases in funding for formula programs authorized by Congress in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, including Title I-A, Title II-A, Title III, The 21st Century Community Learning Center Program, and Title IV-A, to support public school teachers and prepare all public school students, including students who are low-income, students learning to speak English, minority students, and students with disabilities, for success in college and their careers.

(5) Increases in funding for STEM, including computer science, and Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs to close the nation's skills gap by ensuring all students have access to high-quality educational programming that prepares them for high-paying careers in a global economy through the integration of academic content and technical skills.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) reforms or otherwise improves the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide greater and more timely access to quality health care and to enhance the delivery of benefits to the Nation's veterans, or improves the delivery of health care to servicemembers;

(2) improves the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental illnesses, and increases the capacity to address health care needs unique to women veterans;

(3) makes improvements to the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 to ensure that veterans receive the educational benefits they need to maximize their employment opportunities;

(4) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military per-

sonnel or veterans, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(5) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay (concurrent receipt);

(6) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation; or

(7) improves information technology at the Department of Veterans Affairs, including for the purchase and implementation of the same electronic health record system used by the Department of Defense;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that strengthens or protects retirement security by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022. The revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) improve the security of existing pension plans, including public- and private-sector plans, single- and multi-employer plans, and the Central States Pension Fund;

(2) address the impending insolvency of the coal miners' pension plan (1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension plan) that, if left unfunded, will jeopardize the solvency of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation insurance fund;

(3) improve access to and quality of existing pension plans, including both defined-benefit and defined-contribution plans; and

(4) create new options or incentives for employers to offer pension or retirement savings plans, and/or for employees to participate in them.

SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides tax incentives for or otherwise encourages the production of renewable energy or increased energy efficiency;

(2) encourages investment in emerging clean energy or vehicle technologies or carbon capture and sequestration;

(3) provides additional resources for oversight and expanded enforcement activities to crack down on speculation in and manipulation of oil and gas markets, including derivatives markets;

(4) limits and provides for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;

(5) assists businesses, industries, States, communities, the environment, workers, or households as the United States moves toward reducing and offsetting the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions; or

(6) facilitates the training of workers for these industries ("clean energy jobs")

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS**SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2019 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2020, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for all discretionary programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018.

SEC. 302. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES UNDER THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates \$4,860,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service under the Enforcement appropriation title to carry out tax enforcement activities and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$514,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service that is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap (taxes owed but not paid), the Chair of the Budget Committee shall increase the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(2) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates \$151,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemploy-

ment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$35,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(c) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 303. COSTS OF EMERGENCY NEEDS, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS, AND DISASTER RELIEF.

(a) EMERGENCY NEEDS.—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority shall not count for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or this resolution.

(b) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for Overseas Contingency Operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to, but not to exceed, the total amount of budget authority specified in section 102(21).

(c) DISASTER RELIEF.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated for disaster relief pursuant to this subsection, then the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and as necessary, the aggregates in this resolution, shall be adjusted by the amount of new budget authority and outlays up to the amounts provided under section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as adjusted by subsection (d).

(d) WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION OPERATIONS.—

(1) CAP ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for wildfire suppression operations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates a base amount equal to 70 percent of the average cost of wildfire suppression operations over the previous 10 years and provides an additional appropriation of up to but not to exceed \$1,154,000,000 for wildfire suppression operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the additional amount of budget authority above the base amount and the outlays resulting from that additional budget authority.

(2) DEFICIT-NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENT.—The total allowable discretionary adjustment for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the

sum of allocation increases made pursuant to paragraph (1) in the previous year.

(e) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsections (b), (c), and (d) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 304. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the House Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

SEC. 305. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—In the House, any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this resolution.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for legislation which has received final congressional approval in the same form by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but has yet to be presented to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

SEC. 306. ADJUSTMENTS FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, reconciliation targets, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's update to its baseline for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 307. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

In the House, and pursuant to section 301(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the remainder of the 115th Congress, the following shall apply in lieu of “CUTGO” rules and principles:

(1)(A) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the on-budget deficit or reducing the on-budget surplus for the period comprising either—

(i) the current year, the budget year, and the four years following that budget year; or

(ii) the current year, the budget year, and the nine years following that budget year.

(B) The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(C) For the purpose of this section, the terms “budget year”, “current year”, and “direct spending” have the meanings specified in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that the term “direct spending” shall also include provisions in appropriation Acts that make outyear modifications to substantive law as described in section 3(4)(C) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(2) If a bill, joint resolution, or amendment is considered pursuant to a special order of the House directing the Clerk to add as a new matter at the end of such measure the provisions of a separate measure as passed by the House, the provisions of such separate measure as passed by the House shall be included in the evaluation under paragraph (1) of the bill, joint resolution, or amendment.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall exclude a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles in the case of a point of order under this clause against consideration of—

- (i) bill or joint resolution;
- (ii) an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business;
- (iii) a conference report; or
- (iv) an amendment between the Houses.

(B) In the case of an amendment (other than one specified in subparagraph (A)) to a bill or joint resolution, the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall give no cognizance to any designation of emergency.

(C) If a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business, a conference report, or an amendment between the Houses includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

SEC. 308. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 401. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Making health care coverage affordable and accessible for all American families will improve their health and financial security, which will make the economy stronger.

(2) Medicaid is the Nation’s largest health insurance program, providing quality, comprehensive, and affordable coverage to more than 70 million vulnerable Americans, including more than one in three children.

(3) Millions of low-income seniors and people with disabilities rely on Medicaid to pay for nursing home care and home- and community-based services that provide help with activities of daily living.

(4) Medicaid coverage provides financial stability to families struggling to escape poverty and to parents of children with disabilities and special health care needs.

(5) The existing financing structure of Medicaid ensures that Federal contributions keep pace with costs and enables States to respond to changing needs, such as increased enrollment in coverage during economic downturns or an aging population that requires extensive long-term care services.

(6) Under the Affordable Care Act, 31 States and the District of Columbia have expanded Medicaid eligibility to low-income adults, including working parents who do not receive coverage through their employers.

(7) Roughly 20 million previously uninsured people have gained health care coverage under the Affordable Care Act, reducing the Nation’s uninsured rate for working-age adults to one of the lowest levels on record.

(8) The law provides premium tax credits that vary by income and the local cost of coverage and cost-sharing assistance to help low- and middle-income families afford quality insurance and pay their out-of-pocket costs.

(9) The law prohibits insurers from denying coverage or charging higher premiums based on pre-existing conditions, requires coverage of essential health benefits like maternity care and prescription drugs, limits out-of-pocket costs, and prohibits lifetime and annual limits on coverage.

(10) The law put in place significant cost-saving reforms to Federal health programs that have played a part in slowing the rate of healthcare spending growth in recent years, with 2011, 2012, and 2013 experiencing the slowest growth rates in real per capita national health expenditures on record.

(11) On May 4, 2017, the House of Representatives passed H.R.1628, the American Health Care Act of 2017, legislation that would repeal provisions of the Affordable Care Act, make deep cuts in Medicaid, and—

(A) result in 23 million Americans losing health insurance in 2026, including 14 million people losing Medicaid;

(B) dramatically increase costs for older adults, low-income families, and people with pre-existing conditions;

(C) reduce Medicaid spending by \$834 billion over ten years;

(D) jeopardize care for seniors in nursing homes, children with disabilities, and families receiving Medicaid benefits as States look to reduce coverage and services;

(E) severely undermine access to substance abuse treatment during the nationwide opioid epidemic;

(F) shorten the life of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund; and

(G) provide nearly \$1 trillion in tax cuts that mostly benefit millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) Congress should build upon the progress of the Affordable Care Act to make health care coverage more affordable and accessible to all American families, and reject any measures to repeal or undermine the law;

(2) the Administration and Congress should fully implement, enforce, and fund the Affordable Care Act, and stop any efforts to sabotage the health insurance marketplaces; and

(3) Congress should preserve Medicaid and not dismantle it by converting Medicaid into a block grant, per capita cap, or other financing arrangement that would limit Federal contributions and render the program incapable of responding to increased need that may result from trends in demographics or health care costs or from economic conditions.

SEC. 402. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM THAT PROVIDES SUPPORT AND RELIEF TO HARDWORKING AMERICAN FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Tax plans from House Republicans and President Trump prioritize tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations, while shifting more of the burden onto everyone else. Their plans fail to close special interest loopholes in the tax code, and even add trillions of dollars of new loopholes for the wealthy. These plans reflect the failed theory of “trickle-down” economics, which creates few jobs and instead leads to massive deficits. A return to these policies would—

(A) fail to create good paying middle-class jobs;

(B) do nothing to help low-income or middle-class households with the rising costs of health care, education, housing, child care, or retirement; and

(C) widen the income gap between millionaires and billionaires and the middle class.

(2) Americans today are working harder than ever, but continue to struggle to find good jobs, get ahead, and stay ahead. This is part of a four-decade trend of stagnant wages for middle-class and low-income households, even as millionaires and billionaires become richer and corporations reap massive profits.

(3) The Obama Administration ended with 83 consecutive months of private-sector job growth, but challenges still remain to create more good-paying jobs and broadly shared prosperity. The number of long-term unemployed remains elevated, and unemployment for people of color continues to be higher than the rest of the population. Many areas remain in need of well-paying jobs.

(4) By almost any metric, the middle class has seen little to no improvements in their incomes. Real median household income in 2013 was only \$7,000 higher than it was in 1979. Median weekly real earnings for workers increased less than 1 percent from 1979 to 2014. Poorer workers have done even worse. For workers in the lower half of the income scale, real annual wages from 1979 to 2014 grew only \$76. And the entire lower 50 percent of the United States population holds a mere 1 percent of total national wealth.

(5) All the while, millionaires and billionaires have seen their incomes and wealth skyrocket. Incomes for the top one percent of households grew five times as fast as for middle-income workers, and now average over \$1 million a year. CEOs make nearly 300 times what the typical worker does. Ten percent of the population owns 76 percent of the Nation’s total wealth, and the average net assets of the top one percent now exceed \$10 million per person.

(6) The top one percent of households receives a disproportionate share—17 percent—of the benefit of major tax expenditures. This uneven distribution of major tax expenditures has exacerbated income and wealth inequality. The tax code treats income from wealth more favorably than income from work by giving preferential tax rates on unearned income, and it contains numerous, wasteful tax breaks for special interests.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House to responsibly reform the tax code to provide support and relief to low- and middle-income families, create good-paying jobs, and drive broadly-shared prosperity, while closing special-interest loopholes and making sure the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share.

SEC. 403. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE FUNDING INCREASES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The current spending limits set by the Budget Control Act of 2011 are too low, for both defense and nondefense funding. Defense and nondefense investments must be at appropriate levels to protect both national security and economic security. The nondefense discretionary spending limit for 2018 is \$2 billion less than it was in 2016, in nominal terms, representing a significant cut to purchasing power. If the inflation rate is what the Congressional Budget Office projects, the 2018 cap represents a reduction of nearly \$30 billion compared with 2016. Defense spending faces similar reductions.

(2) The Budget Control Act of 2011 is based on parity for defense and nondefense spending, setting up separate caps for both and instituting a “firewall” to prevent reductions in one category because of increases in the other.

(3) Bipartisan agreement has provided a solution to the austerity-level caps before, and can be used again to change these arbitrary spending caps to prevent the harsh impact of massive, irresponsible cuts to important Federal programs.

(4) Congress must begin discussions and negotiations immediately, to raise the caps to appropriate levels, and maintain parity between defense and nondefense.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE FUNDING INCREASES.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress should enact increases to the current defense and nondefense spending limits, in equal amounts, without using reductions in one category to pay for increases in the other.

SEC. 404. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON IMMIGRATION REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Fixing the country’s broken immigration system will mean safer communities, a stronger economy and lower budget deficits.

(2) The Congressional Budget Office estimated that enacting the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, as introduced by House Democrats in the 113th Congress, would have reduced the deficit by \$900 billion over the next 2 decades, boosting the economy by 5.4 percent, and increasing productivity by 1.0 percent.

(3) The Social Security Actuary estimated that immigration reform will reduce the Social Security shortfall by 8 percent and will extend the life of the Social Security Trust Fund by 2 years.

(4) The United States is a Nation founded, built and sustained by immigrants, and the Congress has a responsibility to harness the power of that tradition by implementing an effective and fair immigration policy.

(5) The current immigration system is broken because it keeps families of legal immigrants and United States citizens separated for decades, it allows for the exploitation of undocumented workers to the detriment of all workers, it does not meet the needs of our economy and discourages legal immigration, and it keeps millions of hard-working, law-abiding families who have lived in our communities for decades hiding in the shadows, including many thousands who came to the United States as infants or young children.

(6) Overly aggressive immigration enforcement that focuses on individuals with deep ties to the United States hurts State and local law enforcement efforts to establish and maintain trust with immigrant communities. The number of Latinos reporting crimes in big cities across the country is lower than past years, particularly among domestic violence and sexual assault victims.

(7) The vast majority of individuals in U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody have not been convicted of a

serious crime. ICE’s own statistics demonstrate that arrests of people with no criminal record increased 157 percent in the first 100 days of the Trump Administration, and only 6.5 percent of those arrested were convicted of violent crimes.

(8) The number of detained asylum seekers continues to rise dramatically and detaining asylum seekers, other vulnerable populations, and those who do not pose risks to public safety is unnecessary and wasteful.

(9) Increasing the use of alternatives to detention rather than expanding immigration detention would be more humane and cost-effective.

(10) It has been nearly four years since the Senate passed, on a bipartisan basis, its comprehensive immigration reform bill.

(11) Immigration reform is needed to secure the sovereignty of the United States of America and to establish a coherent and just system for integrating those who seek to join American society.

(12) A successful immigration system cannot rely on border security alone. The country needs a system that promotes the reunification of families, protects workers and is responsive to the needs of employers, and implements an inclusive legalization program for those who are currently here.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress enact comprehensive immigration reform – such as the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, introduced by House Democrats in the 113th Congress – to boost our economy, lower deficits, establish clear and just rules for citizenship, and make our communities safer.

SEC. 405. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Most of the 61 million Americans who currently receive earned Social Security benefits rely on these benefits for the majority of their income, with nearly a quarter of them relying on Social Security for at least 90 percent of their income.

(2) In the past, Social Security benefits were part of a 3-legged stool where retirees relied on a combination of Social Security, a private pension, and personal savings to finance retirement.

(3) Social Security benefits will be more important to future retirees as few workers will receive traditional pensions, and many workers cannot afford to adequately fund their retirement through employer-sponsored savings plans or IRAs.

(4) Social Security’s Disability Insurance (DI) and Old Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) systems are intertwined both in their benefit structure and in their revenues – DI recipients who reach retirement age receive OASI benefits and beneficiaries in each category have helped finance the other category even if they will never receive those benefits.

(5) Social Security benefits are already being cut as Social Security’s normal retirement age is increasing from 66 years for workers retiring now to 67 years for those born in 1960 and later. This cut disproportionately impacts low-earners because life expectancy continues to increase among higher-earners but not low-earners. Thus, high-earners will generally receive benefits for a longer time than low-earners.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that the House of Representatives will not adopt changes to Social Security that involve reductions in earned Social Security benefits.

SEC. 406. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Senior citizens and persons with disabilities highly value the Medicare program and rely on Medicare to guarantee their health and financial security.

(2) In 2018, 60,000,000 people will rely on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services.

(3) The Medicare program has lower administrative costs than private insurance, and Medicare costs per enrollee have grown at a slower rate than private insurance for a given level of benefits.

(4) People with Medicare already have the ability to choose a private insurance plan within Medicare through the Medicare Advantage option, yet two-thirds of Medicare beneficiaries chose the traditional fee-for-service program instead of a private plan in 2016.

(5) Rising health care costs are not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, they are endemic to the entire health care system.

(6) Converting Medicare into a voucher for the purchase of health insurance will merely force seniors and individuals with disabilities to pay much higher premiums if they want to use their voucher to purchase traditional Medicare coverage.

(7) A voucher system in which the voucher payment fails to keep pace with growth in health costs would expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks.

(8) Shifting more health care costs onto Medicare beneficiaries would not reduce overall health care costs, instead it would mean beneficiaries would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both.

(9) Versions of voucher policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely set it up for a death spiral as private plans siphon off healthier and less expensive beneficiaries, leaving the sickest beneficiaries in a program that will wither away.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that the Medicare guarantee for seniors and persons with disabilities should be preserved and strengthened, and that any legislation to end the Medicare guarantee, financially penalize people for choosing traditional Medicare, or shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of health insurance, should be rejected.

SEC. 407. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON FINANCIAL STABILITY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 is an important component of the country’s response to the financial crisis and recession. It took a number of steps to protect consumers of financial products and services as well as protect taxpayers from the costs of another financial crisis.

(2) These steps included the creation of an orderly liquidation process to allow regulators to close failing institutions that some argue are “too big to fail,” as well as a new Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC), an Office of Financial Research to monitor the stability of our financial system, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (the Consumer Bureau).

(3) The Consumer Bureau plays a critical role in protecting older Americans, military service members, student loan borrowers, and other consumers, especially in minority and low-income communities. It has implemented new rules for mortgage markets and prepaid cards, and also successfully recovered nearly \$12 billion on behalf of more than 29 million consumers and service members.

(4) The Consumer Bureau's funding from the Federal Reserve's operations help give it important independence from efforts to interfere with its vital mission and activities, independence on par with every other banking regulator.

(5) The Consumer Bureau has already faced and overcome efforts to obstruct its operations.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress should continue to support the vital work of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau as well as its governing and financing structures and other key components of the Dodd-Frank legislation such as orderly liquidation authority, FSOC, and the Office of Financial Research.

SEC. 408. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Women's contributions are critical to the economic success of hard-working families.

(2) Not only do women play a key role in maintaining healthy families, they also have unique health care needs and face issues that require special focus.

(3) Every hard-working American deserves to feel safe and supported during retirement. Yet women are more likely to face financial risk during retirement because of their lower lifetime earnings and disproportionate role as family caregivers.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress should economically empower women and protect their health and safety. Congress must enact policies that would accomplish the following:

(1) Help families attain better jobs, fight pay inequity, raise the minimum wage, and enable women entrepreneurs and small businesses to achieve their goals.

(2) Give American families control of their own lives, and help them balance the demands of work and family. These policies include paid and expanded family and medical leave, paid sick days, and quality, affordable child care.

(3) Strengthen the retirement security of women and their families by protecting Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

(4) Support caregivers, many of whom sacrifice their own careers to provide for family members.

(5) Maintain health insurance protections for women, increase funding for the prevention and treatment of women's health issues such as breast cancer and heart disease, and support access to full reproductive care.

(6) Prevent and protect women from domestic violence and sexual abuse.

SEC. 409. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The country faces many national security challenges and we must continue to support a strong military that is second to none.

(2) Those who serve in uniform are our most important security resource and the Administration and Congress shall continue to provide the support they need to successfully carry out the missions the country gives them.

(3) A growing economy is the foundation of our security and enables the country to provide the resources for a strong military, sound homeland security agencies, and effective diplomacy and international development.

(4) Austerity-level spending caps threaten adequate investment in activities critical to our economy and national security, which include activities funded by both the defense and nondefense portions of the discretionary budget.

(5) Diplomacy and foreign aid are essential components of our security and the President's proposal to cut these activities by 32 percent below current levels prompted more than 120 retired admirals and generals who have first-hand knowledge of their effectiveness in securing our Nation to forcefully object.

(6) The Nation's projected long-term debt could have serious consequences for our economy and security, and that more efficient military spending has to be part of an overall plan that effectively deals with this problem.

(7) Reining in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies, including the Department of Defense—the last department still unable to pass an audit—such as the elimination of duplicative programs and better controlling delays and cost overruns on weapon systems that have been identified by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) needs to continue as a priority.

(8) The Department of Defense should continue to review defense plans and requirements to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant, are affordable, and are applicable to 21st century threats; and such review should include, with the participation of the National Nuclear Security Administration, examination of requirements for, and cost of, the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization.

(9) Nonwar operation and maintenance costs per active-duty service member have grown at a rate well above inflation for decades—from \$59,000 per service member in 1980 to \$157,000 per service member in 2015 (measured in constant 2017 dollars), and it is imperative that unsustainable cost growth be controlled in this area.

(10) Cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing “loose nukes” and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) the austerity-level spending caps required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 for fiscal years 2018 through 2021 should be rescinded and replaced by a fiscal plan that is balanced and takes into account a comprehensive national security strategy that includes careful consideration of international, defense, homeland security, and law enforcement programs; and

(2) efficiencies can be achieved in the national defense budget without compromising our security through greater emphasis on eliminating duplicative and wasteful programs, reforming the acquisition process, identifying and constraining unsustainable operating costs, and through careful analysis of our national security needs.

SEC. 410. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) continues to face challenges meeting the needs of the next generation of returning veterans, including sufficient funding to provide critical services and benefits.

(2) Access to quality health care and veterans' benefits has been an ongoing challenge for the VA, highlighted most recently in the ongoing claims backlog and veterans waiting months for health care appointments.

(3) Providing health care where veterans live and ensuring a sufficient number of health care professionals, especially in the

area of mental health treatment, have also been challenges.

(4) The VA has made progress in reducing the number of initial benefit claims, dropping the claims backlog to less than 94,000 from a peak of 611,000 claims just a few years ago, but that statistic leaves out the many veterans who are still waiting many months or even years to have their appeals decided.

(5) The President's budget includes a 6 percent increase over current-year funding but shifts funding away from critical programs that veterans rely on in favor of expanded funding that pays for certain veterans to get private health care at the expense of care provided at VA hospitals and clinics.

(6) The President's budget also cuts funding from other Federal agencies that provide lifesaving programs and services for veterans, including deep cuts to Medicaid benefits veterans rely on, the elimination of the Interagency Council on Homelessness, steep cuts at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, elimination of the Legal Services Corporation, and severe cuts to entrepreneurship outreach programs targeted to veterans through the Small Business Administration.

(7) The VA currently has advance appropriations for approximately 85 percent of its discretionary budget. The residual 15 percent, which includes funding for the day-to-day operations at the Veterans Benefits Administration, remains vulnerable to a Government shutdown.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) Congress should support a funding level no less than the President's request for veterans' discretionary programs so that the VA has the resources it needs to ensure veterans get the health care and benefits they earned in a timely fashion;

(2) Congress should lift the austerity-level funding cap on nondefense programs for 2018 and beyond to ensure adequate funding for veterans' programs;

(3) advance appropriations be expanded to cover all of VA's discretionary budget to prevent delays in veterans' benefits and services during a Government shutdown;

(4) the VA submit along with its annual budget a “Future-Years Veterans Program” that projects its needs over five years to help facilitate the appropriations and oversight processes;

(5) Congress should provide sufficient resources for the VA's Office of the Inspector General to guarantee veterans are properly served and that resources are spent efficiently;

(6) no changes be made to the Individual Unemployability benefit to ensure that disabled veterans, many of them severely disabled, who are deemed unable to engage in substantial work as a result of their service to our country, continue to receive the full disability and social security benefits they earned and were promised; and

(7) Congress shall provide sufficient funding and staff resources for VA hospitals and clinics, and that any increased funding for private and community care not provided directly by the VA should not come at the expense of necessary resources for VA hospitals and clinics.

SEC. 411. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON DISASTER RESPONSE FUNDING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House find the following:

(1) Natural disasters such as hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria require swift congressional action to help storm survivors get their lives back on track, rebuild disaster-stricken communities, and prevent further damage to the economy.

(2) The Budget Control Act of 2001 provides procedural tools specifically to respond to

natural disasters, by allowing adjustments to the spending caps for disaster and emergency spending.

(3) Mitigation and prevention is an important part of disaster recovery and response, providing investments that make future disasters less costly in terms of both dollars and lives.

(b) **POLICY ON FUNDING FOR DISASTER RESPONSE AND RECOVERY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress should act swiftly to assist with recovery from hurricanes and other natural disasters. Such funding should be provided using the budgetary provisions in place for this purpose: providing adjustments to the spending caps for disaster and emergency response, recovery, and mitigation. Congress must also support efforts to address future disaster damage and loss, by appropriately funding mitigation and prevention efforts.

SEC. 412. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal workforce provides vital services to our Nation on a daily basis. It includes those who patrol and secure our borders, protect us from terrorists, take care of our veterans, help run our airports, counter cyber-attacks, find cures for deadly diseases, and keep our food supply safe.

(2) Veterans make up 31 percent of the Federal workforce.

(3) Many Federal workers are paid at a rate that is far below their private sector counterparts.

(4) The Federal workforce is older than in past decades and older than the private sector workforce. Nearly one third of the Federal workforce is eligible to retire.

(5) Federal employee pay and benefits are not the cause of the country's deficits and debt. The Federal workforce has already contributed more than \$180 billion toward reducing the country's deficits in the form of pay freezes, pay raises insufficient to keep pace with inflation, furloughs, and increased retirement contributions. The President's budget for 2018 continues to unfairly target the Federal workforce by proposing an additional \$149 billion in compensation and retirement benefit cuts.

(6) Since 1975, the Federal workforce has declined 35 percent relative to the size of the population of the United States.

(7) Nearly all of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce from 2001 to 2016 is due to increases at security-related agencies, including the Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, and Department of Veterans Affairs.

(8) Proposals to reduce the size of the workforce at nonsecurity agencies by 10 percent have excluded an assessment of their impact on government services.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress should not target Federal employees to achieve further reductions in the deficit as they have already contributed more than their fair share, that Federal workers should be compensated with pay and benefits at a level that enables the government to attract high quality people—which is especially important during this period when more workers will be retiring—and that no proposal to reduce the size of the workforce should be considered without an assessment of its impact on government services.

SEC. 413. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Global climate change is a threat to national security, public health, and economic growth.

(2) The United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded that the effects of climate change are occurring worldwide, stating: "The impacts of climate change have already been felt in recent decades on all continents and across the oceans".

(3) The United States Government Accountability Office described climate change as, "a complex, crosscutting issue that poses risks to many environmental and economic systems—including agriculture, infrastructure, ecosystems, and human health—and presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government".

(4) In March 2017, Secretary of Defense James Mattis, in written testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee, stated that "climate change can be a driver of instability and the Department of Defense must pay attention to potential adverse impacts generated by this phenomenon".

(5) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reported that 2016 was the warmest year on record, setting a new record for global average surface temperatures for the third year in a row. Furthermore, 16 of the 17 warmest years on record have occurred since 2001.

(6) The United States National Research Council's National Climate Assessment and Development Advisory Committee found climate change affects "human health, water supply, agriculture, transportation, energy, coastal areas, and many other sectors of society, with increasingly adverse impacts on the American economy and quality of life".

(7) The most vulnerable among us, including children, the elderly, low-income individuals, and those with underlying health conditions, face even greater health risks as a result of climate change.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that climate change presents a significant public health, environmental, and financial risk to the United States. The United States must continue to play a leadership role on climate change policy and should not retreat from global commitments on climate change. Congress must provide robust funding for climate change science, which provides critical information for protecting human health, defending the United States, and preserving economic and environmental systems throughout the world.

SEC. 414. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON INCREASED EFFICIENCY AND ELIMINATING WASTE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office ("GAO") identifies examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and makes regular recommendations regarding ways to reduce costs and increase revenue.

(2) The Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs "could lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings, with significant opportunities for improved efficiencies, cost savings, or revenue enhancements in the areas of defense, information technology, education and training, health care, energy, and tax enforcement."

(3) The tax gap, the difference between taxes owed and taxes paid, now averages \$458 billion annually. Even modest improvements in enforcing existing law could yield a boost in revenue without any changes to the tax code.

(4) Tax expenditures, or spending through the tax code, total \$1.5 trillion per year and represent the largest category of spending in the budget — exceeding Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. However, unlike other types of spending, tax expenditures are not

reviewed in any systematic way in the annual budget process.

(5) Improper payments, payments that should not have been made or that were made in an incorrect amount, totaled \$144 billion for 2016. While some improper payments are the result of fraud, the vast majority are due to unintentional errors, such as payments to eligible beneficiaries that were not properly verified, or overpayments or underpayments because of a data entry mistake.

(6) Shutting down the government, arbitrarily cutting agency budgets, and funding large portions of the government through stop-gap appropriations do not lead to efficient and effective government.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress must continue to root out wasteful spending, make government operations more efficient, pass appropriations bills on time, and avoid costly government shutdowns. Congress must task agencies with shrinking the error rate in government programs and provide adequate budgetary resources for agencies to develop new processes, review expenditures, and improve information technology systems.

SEC. 415. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 U.S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Free and fair elections are the cornerstone of our democracy, and foreign interference in them undermines the public trust and casts doubt on the legitimacy of our government.

(2) The country's intelligence agencies all agree that Russia launched a campaign to undermine the 2016 U.S. presidential election, which included cyber-attacks, dissemination of false information, and other intelligence operations to malign Secretary Hillary Clinton and increase the odds of a Donald Trump presidency.

(3) Members of the Trump campaign had repeated contact with Russian government officials and oligarchs and then failed to report this contact in testimony to Congress and in security clearance applications. One such meeting reportedly included a request for a back-channel line of communications with the Russian government using Russian facilities, which would preclude U.S. Government oversight. Another involved a Kremlin-linked Russian lawyer and a former Soviet counterintelligence officer under the assumption that they would provide politically damaging information about Secretary Hillary Clinton as part of the Russian government's effort to support the Trump campaign.

(4) Under the direction of Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, the FBI was investigating whether members of President Trump's campaign colluded with Russia to influence the election.

(5) On May 9, 2017, President Trump fired FBI Director Comey and then made statements suggesting his dismissal was to stop the investigation of collusion.

(6) On May 17, 2017, the Department of Justice announced the appointment of former FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III to serve as Special Counsel to investigate Russian interference into the 2016 presidential election and any coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the Trump campaign.

(b) **POLICY ON THE INVESTIGATION OF RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 U.S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that to restore confidence in our government and to preserve the sanctity of our electoral process, Congress must ensure adequate funding for the

Special Counsel appointed by the Department of Justice so that he can perform a thorough and nonpartisan investigation of Russia's campaign to affect the 2016 U.S. presidential election and any individuals in the United States that may have colluded in those efforts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Democrats and Republicans are looking at the same challenges facing our country and American families. Education, healthcare, and housing costs have all increased while wages stay stagnant.

It used to be that the two parties would debate different strategies to address the problems facing the American people. Sadly, those times are behind us.

In giving millionaires, including the majority of this Congress, the President, and wealthy donors a giant tax cut, the Republican budget does not even pretend to address the problems facing the American people. Not only does it ignore working families, it increases their challenges.

The Democratic budget alternative, in stark contrast to the Republican budget, begins to address the real challenges our country faces now and in the long term.

□ 1015

We are less than a decade removed from the worst economic crisis in most of our lifetimes, and we have a chance to rebound in a way that builds a foundation for our country to thrive for generations, but we have to seize that opportunity.

Rather than giving resources to people and businesses that already have them, we are calling for targeted investments in programs that grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and provide real support for working families and real security in retirement.

Rather than sending thank-you notes to the corporations that bankroll campaigns, we have an opportunity to make vital public investments that lead to a brighter future rebuilding roads, bridges, and other critical infrastructure, all of which lead to good jobs now and in the long run.

Rather than giving the President a multimillion-dollar refund on taxes he refuses to disclose, we can invest in retirement security for seniors who didn't inherit millions. We can invest in affordable education so young people do not have to grow up wealthy to have a shot at earning it in their future careers.

Instead of taking healthcare away from people, straining emergency rooms, and making Americans sicker, we have an opportunity to continue investing in affordable quality

healthcare for all of us, finally eliminating a great burden on American families, a burden that no other developed nation shares.

This budget is an opportunity for our country to invest in our future, and if we adopt the Republican budget plan, we will have squandered it.

Democrats believe in a government that prioritizes American families, and they should be the priorities of this Congress. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget and support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this budget substitute, which is, put simply, an abdication of our fiscal responsibility as a governing body.

Our country is \$20 trillion in debt, with \$9 trillion added to the national debt during the Obama years. We have the responsibility to our children and our grandchildren to stop this Congress' addiction to spending. It is a responsibility that I take seriously; it is a responsibility that the members of my committee take seriously; and it is a responsibility that Republicans in the House take seriously.

Clearly, it is not a responsibility that our friends across the aisle take seriously. Our budget works to end the addiction to spending that has dominated Washington for far too long.

The House budget, passed out of committee with unanimous Republican support in July, begins to address our spending addiction by balancing the budget over 10 years so that we can start paying down our national debt, and it addresses mandatory spending in a significant way for the first time since 1997.

This budget substitute does quite the opposite. The Democrats' budget raises taxes by \$2.7 trillion, which would be the largest tax increase in U.S. history. It increases spending by \$6.2 trillion, compared to the budget passed by my committee. It never balances, with a deficit in 2027 of \$852 billion.

What we hear from the other side of the aisle and what we see in this budget is simply more of same: more spending, more tax increases, and more debt. I don't think that is acceptable, and neither do the American people.

Since we began this budget debate yesterday, my counterparts on the other side of the aisle have been throwing out misleading numbers about our budget and our tax reform effort in order to hide the fact that they offer no new solutions to the most pressing problems our country faces.

Here is a number that they should keep in mind while they discuss this fiscally irresponsible substitute. The

national debt for every person is over \$63,000. Every man, woman, and even child in our country has a \$63,000 weight hanging over their heads. Our budget takes real steps to fix this crisis. This budget substitute does not. Honestly, it is as simple as that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this Democrat substitute, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, once again, House Republicans are determined to visit cruel and unusual punishment on the American people by presenting a budget that is reckless, regressive, and reprehensible. It is a budget that will hurt working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, veterans, and rural America.

It is a budget that will eradicate the social safety net, end Medicare as we know it, rip away health insurance from 23 million Americans, and impose billions and billions of dollars in life-altering debt on younger Americans.

It is outrageous that this is all being done to enact tax cuts for the wealthy and the well-off, tax cuts for the privileged few, tax cuts for special interests here in Washington, D.C.

This parade of horrors is being jammed down the throats of this country so that everyday Americans can subsidize the lifestyles of the rich and shameless.

We deserve better. The Democratic budget will invest in transportation and infrastructure, invest in education and job training, invest in the social safety net, invest in research and development, invest in affordable housing, and invest in the wellbeing of everyday Americans.

The Republican budget is a raw deal. The Democratic budget is a better deal, focused on better jobs, better wages, and a better future. It is worthy of our support.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HANDEL) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1117. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit a report regarding certain plans regarding assistance to applicants and grantees during the response to an emergency or disaster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY).

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chair, with all respect, the cruel and unusual punishment is the Democratic-proposed substitute amendment. The raw deal is the Democratic-proposed substitute amendment that increases spending \$6.2 trillion over our budget.

This thing raises taxes—\$2.7 trillion, the largest tax increase in American history, at a time when we are drowning in debt and stagnant wage growth.

It requires a one-to-one match of defense and nondefense discretionary spending at a time when we can't keep our F-18s flying and we have airplanes crashing around the country for lack of maintenance.

This is unconscionable. This budget never balances. It will leave us with an \$852 billion deficit by fiscal year 2027. It expands ObamaCare, the most disastrous and heinous trick played on the American people that I can remember. It prioritizes amnesty over security.

We are never going to get our country straight and preserve our sovereignty if we don't protect our security. On the other hand, we have got the Republican budget that offers to do a lot of things. One thing it offers to do is put a work requirement for able-bodied adults with no dependent children into welfare.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD an article by Nicholas Eberstadt of AEI talking about the horrible condition of our labor force now and how drastically important this is and how much it will improve the opportunities for people to rise out of poverty. We have got three 25- to 54-year-old males sitting out of the labor force collecting benefits for every one that is unemployed. The unemployed rate is 4.7 percent. That makes the total 20 percent. It is almost over 5 million people that we owe them a moral obligation to offer them an opportunity to rise out of poverty through work, and that is what the Republican budget does.

[Commentary, Feb. 15, 2017]

ECONOMY: OUR MISERABLE 21ST CENTURY

(By Nicholas N. Eberstadt)

On the morning of November 9, 2016, American's elite—its talking and deciding classes—woke up to a country they did not know. To most privileged and well-educated Americans, especially those living in its bicoastal bastions, the election of Donald Trump had been a thing almost impossible even to imagine. What sort of country would go and elect someone like Trump as president? Certainly not one they were familiar with, or understood anything about.

Whatever else it may or may not have accomplished, the 2016 election was a sort of shock therapy for Americans living within what Charles Murray famously termed "the bubble" (the protective barrier of prosperity and self-selected associations that increasingly shield our best and brightest from contact with the rest of their society). The very fact of Trump's election served as a truth broadcast about a reality that could no longer be denied: Things out there in Amer-

ica are a whole lot different from what you thought.

Yes, things are very different indeed these days in the "real America" outside the bubble. In fact, things have been going badly wrong in America since the beginning of the 21st century.

It turns out that the year 2000 marks a grim historical milestone of sorts for our nation. For whatever reasons, the Great American Escalator, which had lifted successive generations of Americans to ever higher standards of living and levels of social well-being, broke down around then—and broke down very badly.

The warning lights have been flashing, and the klaxons sounding, for more than a decade and a half. But our pundits and prognosticators and professors and policymakers, ensconced as they generally are deep within the bubble, were for the most part too distant from the distress of the general population to see or hear it. (So much for the vaunted "information era" and "big-data revolution.") Now that those signals are no longer possible to ignore, it is high time for experts and intellectuals to reacquire themselves with the country in which they live and to begin the task of describing what has befallen the country in which we have lived since the dawn of the new century.

Consider the condition of the American economy. In some circles people still widely believe, as one recent New York Times business-section article cluelessly insisted before the inauguration, that "Mr. Trump will inherit an economy that is fundamentally solid." But this is patent nonsense. By now it should be painfully obvious that the U.S. economy has been in the grip of deep dysfunction since the dawn of the new century. And in retrospect, it should also be apparent that America's strange new economic maladies were almost perfectly designed to set the stage for a populist storm.

Ever since 2000, basic indicators have offered oddly inconsistent readings on America's economic performance and prospects. It is curious and highly uncharacteristic to find such measures so very far out of alignment with one another. We are witnessing an ominous and growing divergence between three trends that should ordinarily move in tandem: wealth, output, and employment.

Depending upon which of these three indicators you choose, America looks to be heading up, down, or more or less nowhere. From the standpoint of wealth creation, the 21st century is off to a roaring start. By this yardstick, it looks as if Americans have never had it so good and as if the future is full of promise. Between early 2000 and late 2016, the estimated net worth of American households and nonprofit institutions more than doubled, from \$44 trillion to \$90 trillion.

Although that wealth is not evenly distributed, it is still a fantastic sum of money—an average of over a million dollars for every notional family of four. This upsurge of wealth took place despite the crash of 2008—indeed, private wealth holdings are over \$20 trillion higher now than they were at their pre-crash apogee. The value of American real-estate assets is near or at all-time highs, and America's businesses appear to be thriving. Even before the "Trump rally" of late 2016 and early 2017, U.S. equities markets were hitting new highs—and since stock prices are strongly shaped by expectations of future profits, investors evidently are counting on the continuation of the current happy days for U.S. asset holders for some time to come.

A rather less cheering picture, though, emerges if we look instead at real trends for the macro-economy. Here, performance since the start of the century might charitably be described as mediocre, and prospects today

are no better than guarded. The recovery from the crash of 2008—which unleashed the worst recession since the Great Depression—has been singularly slow and weak. According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), it took nearly four years for America's gross domestic product (GDP) to re-attain its late 2007 level. As of late 2016, total value added to the U.S. economy was just 12 percent higher than in 2007. The situation is even more sobering if we consider per capita growth. It took America six and a half years—until mid-2014—to get back to its late 2007 per capita production levels. And in late 2016, per capita output was just 4 percent higher than in late 2007—nine years earlier. By this reckoning, the American economy looks to have suffered something close to a lost decade.

But there was clearly trouble brewing in America's macro-economy well before the 2008 crash, too. Between late 2000 and late 2007, per capita GDP growth averaged less than 1.5 percent per annum. That compares with the nation's long-term postwar 1948–2000 per capita growth rate of almost 2.3 percent, which in turn can be compared to the "snap back" tempo of 1.1 percent per annum since per capita GDP bottomed out in 2009. Between 2000 and 2016, per capita growth in America has averaged less than 1 percent a year. To state it plainly: With postwar, pre-21st-century rates for the years 2000–2016, per capita GDP in America would be more than 20 percent higher than it is today.

The reasons for America's newly fitful and halting macroeconomic performance are still a puzzle to economists and a subject of considerable contention and debate. Economists are generally in consensus, however, in one area: They have begun redefining the growth potential of the U.S. economy downwards. The U.S. Congressional Budget Office (CBO), for example, suggests that the "potential growth" rate for the U.S. economy at full employment of factors of production has now dropped below 1.7 percent a year, implying a sustainable long-term annual per capita economic growth rate for America today of well under 1 percent.

Then there is the employment situation. If 21st-century America's GDP trends have been disappointing, labor-force trends have been utterly dismal. Work rates have fallen off a cliff since the year 2000 and are at their lowest levels in decades. We can see this by looking at the estimates by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) for the civilian employment rate, the jobs-to-population ratio for adult civilian men and women. Between early 2000 and late 2016, America's overall work rate for Americans age 20 and older underwent a drastic decline. It plunged by almost 5 percentage points (from 64.6 to 59.7). Unless you are a labor economist, you may not appreciate just how severe a falloff in employment such numbers attest to. Postwar America never experienced anything comparable.

From peak to trough, the collapse in work rates for U.S. adults between 2008 and 2010 was roughly twice the amplitude of what had previously been the country's worst postwar recession, back in the early 1980s. In that previous steep recession, it took America five years to re-attain the adult work rates recorded at the start of 1980. This time, the U.S. job market has as yet, in early 2017, scarcely begun to claw its way back up to the work rates of 2007—much less back to the work rates from early 2000. U.S. adult work rates never recovered entirely from the recession of 2001—much less the crash of '08.

And the work rates being measured here include people who are engaged in any paid employment—any job, at any wage, for any number of hours of work at all.

On Wall Street and in some parts of Washington these days, one hears that America

has gotten back to “near full employment.” For Americans outside the bubble, such talk must seem nonsensical. It is true that the oft-cited “civilian unemployment rate” looked pretty good by the end of the Obama era—in December 2016, it was down to 4.7 percent, about the same as it had been back in 1965, at a time of genuine full employment. The problem here is that the unemployment rate only tracks joblessness for those still in the labor force; it takes no account of workforce dropouts. Alas, the exodus out of the workforce has been the big labor-market story for America’s new century. (At this writing, for every unemployed American man between 25 and 55 years of age, there are another three who are neither working nor looking for work.) Thus the “unemployment rate” increasingly looks like an antique index devised for some earlier and increasingly distant war: the economic equivalent of a musket inventory or a cavalry count.

By the criterion of adult work rates, by contrast, employment conditions in America remain remarkably bleak. From late 2009 through early 2014, the country’s work rates more or less flatlined. So far as can be told, this is the only “recovery” in U.S. economic history in which that basic labor-market indicator almost completely failed to respond.

Since 2014, there has finally been a measure of improvement in the work rate—but it would be unwise to exaggerate the dimensions of that turnaround. As of late 2016, the adult work rate in America was still at its lowest level in more than 30 years. To put things another way: If our nation’s work rate today were back up to its start-of-the-century highs, well over 10 million more Americans would currently have paying jobs.

There is no way to sugarcoat these awful numbers. They are not a statistical artifact that can be explained away by population aging, or by increased educational enrollment for adult students, or by any other genuine change in contemporary American society. The plain fact is that 21st-century America has witnessed a dreadful collapse of work.

For an apples-to-apples look at America’s 21st-century jobs problem, we can focus on the 25–54 population—known to labor economists for self-evident reasons as the “prime working age” group. For this key labor-force cohort, work rates in late 2016 were down almost 4 percentage points from their year-2000 highs. That is a jobs gap approaching 5 million for this group alone.

It is not only that work rates for prime-age males have fallen since the year 2000—they have, but the collapse of work for American men is a tale that goes back at least half a century. (I wrote a short book last year about this sad saga.) What is perhaps more startling is the unexpected and largely unnoticed fall-off in work rates for prime-age women. In the U.S. and all other Western societies, postwar labor markets underwent an epochal transformation. After World War II, work rates for prime women surged, and continued to rise—until the year 2000. Since then, they too have declined. Current work rates for prime-age women are back to where they were a generation ago, in the late 1980s. The 21st-century U.S. economy has been brutal for male and female laborers alike—and the wreckage in the labor market has been sufficiently powerful to cancel, and even reverse, one of our society’s most distinctive postwar trends: the rise of paid work for women outside the household.

In our era of no more than indifferent economic growth, 21st-century America has somehow managed to produce markedly more wealth for its wealthholders even as it provided markedly less work for its workers. And trends for paid hours of work look even worse than the work rates themselves. Be-

tween 2000 and 2015, according to the BEA, total paid hours of work in America increased by just 4 percent (as against a 35 percent increase for 1985–2000, the 15-year period immediately preceding this one).

Over the 2000–2015 period, however, the adult civilian population rose by almost 18 percent—meaning that paid hours of work per adult civilian have plummeted by a shocking 12 percent thus far in our new American century.

This is the terrible contradiction of economic life in what we might call America’s Second Gilded Age (2000—). It is a paradox that may help us understand a number of overarching features of our new century. These include the consistent findings that public trust in almost all U.S. institutions has sharply declined since 2000, even as growing majorities hold that America is “heading in the wrong direction.” It provides an immediate answer to why overwhelming majorities of respondents in public-opinion surveys continue to tell pollsters, year after year, that our ever-richer America is still stuck in the middle of a recession. The mounting economic woes of the “little people” may not have been generally recognized by those inside the bubble, or even by many bubble inhabitants who claimed to be economic specialists—but they proved to be potent fuel for the populist fire that raged through American politics in 2016.

So general economic conditions for many ordinary Americans—not least of these, Americans who did not fit within the academy’s designated victim classes—have been rather more insecure than those within the comfort of the bubble understood. But the anxiety, dissatisfaction, anger, and despair that range within our borders today are not wholly a reaction to the way our economy is misfiring. On the nonmaterial front, it is likewise clear that many things in our society are going wrong and yet seem beyond our powers to correct.

Some of these gnawing problems are by no means new: A number of them (such as family breakdown) can be traced back at least to the 1960s, while others are arguably as old as modernity itself (anomie and isolation in big anonymous communities, secularization and the decline of faith). But a number have roared down upon us by surprise since the turn of the century—and others have redoubled with fearsome new intensity since roughly the year 2000.

American health conditions seem to have taken a seriously wrong turn in the new century. It is not just that overall health progress has been shockingly slow, despite the trillions we devote to medical services each year. (Which “Cold War babies” among us would have predicted we’d live to see the day when life expectancy in East Germany was higher than in the United States, as is the case today?)

Alas, the problem is not just slowdowns in health progress—there also appears to have been positive retrogression for broad and heretofore seemingly untroubled segments of the national population. A short but electrifying 2015 paper by Anne Case and Nobel Economics Laureate Angus Deaton talked about a mortality trend that had gone almost unnoticed until then: rising death rates for middle-aged U.S. whites. By Case and Deaton’s reckoning, death rates rose somewhat slightly over the 1999–2013 period for all non-Hispanic white men and women 45–54 years of age—but they rose sharply for those with high-school degrees or less, and for this less-educated grouping most of the rise in death rates was accounted for by suicides, chronic liver cirrhosis, and poisonings (including drug overdoses).

Though some researchers, for highly technical reasons, suggested that the mortality

spike might not have been quite as sharp as Case and Deaton reckoned, there is little doubt that the spike itself has taken place. Health has been deteriorating for a significant swath of white America in our new century, thanks in large part to drug and alcohol abuse. All this sounds a little too close for comfort to the story of modern Russia, with its devastating vodka- and drug-binging health setbacks. Yes: It can happen here, and it has. Welcome to our new America.

In December 2016, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that for the first time in decades, life expectancy at birth in the United States had dropped very slightly (to 78.3 years in 2015, from 78.9 years in 2014). Though the decline was small, it was statistically meaningful—rising death rates were characteristic of males and females alike; of blacks and whites and Latinos together. (Only black women avoided mortality increases—their death levels were stagnant.) A jump in “unintentional injuries” accounted for much of the overall uptick.

It would be unwarranted to place too much portent in a single year’s mortality changes; slight annual drops in U.S. life expectancy have occasionally been registered in the past, too, followed by continued improvements. But given other developments we are witnessing in our new America, we must wonder whether the 2015 decline in life expectancy is just a blip, or the start of a new trend. We will find out soon enough. It cannot be encouraging, though, that the Human Mortality Database, an international consortium of demographers who vet national data to improve comparability between countries, has suggested that health progress in America essentially ceased in 2012—that the U.S. gained on average only about a single day of life expectancy at birth between 2012 and 2014, before the 2015 turnaround.

The opioid epidemic of pain pills and heroin that has been ravaging and shortening lives from coast to coast is a new plague for our new century. The terrifying novelty of this particular drug epidemic, of course, is that it has gone (so to speak) “mainstream” this time, effecting breakout from disadvantaged minority communities to Main Street White America. By 2013, according to a 2015 report by the Drug Enforcement Administration, more Americans died from drug overdoses (largely but not wholly opioid abuse) than from either traffic fatalities or guns. The dimensions of the opioid epidemic in the real America are still not fully appreciated within the bubble, where drug use tends to be more carefully limited and recreational. In Dreamland, his harrowing and magisterial account of modern America’s opioid explosion, the journalist Sam Quinones notes in passing that “in one three-month period” just a few years ago, according to the Ohio Department of Health, “fully 11 percent of all Ohioans were prescribed opiates.” And of course many Americans self-medicate with licit or illicit painkillers without doctors’ orders.

In the fall of 2016, Alan Krueger, former chairman of the President’s Council of Economic Advisers, released a study that further refined the picture of the real existing opioid epidemic in America: According to his work, nearly half of all prime working-age male labor-force dropouts—an army now totaling roughly 7 million men—currently take pain medication on a daily basis.

We already knew from other sources (such as BLS “time use” surveys) that the overwhelming majority of the prime-age men in this un-working army generally don’t “do civil society” (charitable work, religious activities, volunteering), or for that matter much in the way of child care or help for others in the home either, despite the abundance of time on their hands. Their routine,

instead, typically centers on watching—watching TV, DVDs, Internet, hand-held devices, etc.—and indeed watching for an average of 2,000 hours a year, as if it were a full-time job. But Krueger's study adds a poignant and immensely sad detail to this portrait of daily life in 21st-century America: In our mind's eye we can now picture many millions of un-working men in the prime of life, out of work and not looking for jobs, sitting in front of screens—stoned.

But how did so many millions of un-working men, whose incomes are limited, manage en masse to afford a constant supply of pain medication? Oxycontin is not cheap. As Dreamland carefully explains, one main mechanism today has been the welfare state: more specifically, Medicaid, Uncle Sam's means-tested health-benefits program. Here is how it works (we are with Quinones in Portsmouth, Ohio):

[The Medicaid card] pays for medicine—whatever pills a doctor deems that the insured patient needs. Among those who receive Medicaid cards are people on state welfare or on a federal disability program known as SSI. . . . If you could get a prescription from a willing doctor—and Portsmouth had plenty of them—Medicaid health-insurance cards paid for that prescription every month. For a three-dollar Medicaid co-pay, therefore, addicts got pills priced at thousands of dollars, with the difference paid for by U.S. and state taxpayers. A user could turn around and sell those pills, obtained for that three-dollar co-pay, for as much as ten thousand dollars on the street.

In 21st-century America, “dependence on government” has thus come to take on an entirely new meaning.

You may now wish to ask: What share of prime-working-age men these days are enrolled in Medicaid? According to the Census Bureau's SIPP survey (Survey of Income and Program Participation), as of 2013, over one-fifth (21 percent) of all civilian men between 25 and 55 years of age were Medicaid beneficiaries. For prime-age people not in the labor force, the share was over half (53 percent). And for un-working Anglos (non-Hispanic white men not in the labor force) of prime working age, the share enrolled in Medicaid was 48 percent.

By the way: Of the entire un-working prime-age male Anglo population in 2013, nearly three-fifths (57 percent) were reportedly collecting disability benefits from one or more government disability program in 2013. Disability checks and means-tested benefits cannot support a lavish lifestyle. But they can offer a permanent alternative to paid employment, and for growing numbers of American men, they do. The rise of these programs has coincided with the death of work for larger and larger numbers of American men not yet of retirement age. We cannot say that these programs caused the death of work for millions upon millions of younger men: What is incontrovertible, however, is that they have financed it—just as Medicaid inadvertently helped finance America's immense and increasing appetite for opioids in our new century.

It is intriguing to note that America's nationwide opioid epidemic has not been accompanied by a nationwide crime wave (excepting of course the apparent explosion of illicit heroin use). Just the opposite: As best can be told, national victimization rates for violent crimes and property crimes have both reportedly dropped by about two-thirds over the past two decades. The drop in crime over the past generation has done great things for the general quality of life in much of America. There is one complication from this drama, however, that inhabitants of the bubble may not be aware of, even though it is all too well known to a great many resi-

dents of the real America. This is the extraordinary expansion of what some have termed America's “criminal class”—the population sentenced to prison or convicted of felony offenses—in recent decades. This trend did not begin in our century, but it has taken on breathtaking enormity since the year 2000.

Most well-informed readers know that the U.S. currently has a higher share of its populace in jail or prison than almost any other country on earth, that Barack Obama and others talk of our criminal-justice process as “mass incarceration,” and know that well over 2 million men were in prison or jail in recent years. But only a tiny fraction of all living Americans ever convicted of a felony is actually incarcerated at this very moment. Quite the contrary: Maybe 90 percent of all sentenced felons today are out of confinement and living more or less among us. The reason: the basic arithmetic of sentencing and incarceration in America today.

Correctional release and sentenced community supervision (probation and parole) guarantee a steady annual “flow” of convicted felons back into society to augment the very considerable “stock” of felons and ex-felons already there. And this “stock” is by now truly enormous.

One forthcoming demographic study by Sarah Shannon and five other researchers estimates that the cohort of current and former felons in America very nearly reached 20 million by the year 2010. If its estimates are roughly accurate, and if America's felon population has continued to grow at more or less the same tempo traced out for the years leading up to 2010, we would expect it to surpass 23 million persons by the end of 2016 at the latest. Very rough calculations might therefore suggest that at this writing, America's population of non-institutionalized adults with a felony conviction somewhere in their past has almost certainly broken the 20 million mark by the end of 2016. A little more rough arithmetic suggests that about 17 million men in our general population have a felony conviction somewhere in their CV. That works out to one of every eight adult males in America today.

We have to use rough estimates here, rather than precise official numbers, because the government does not collect any data at all on the size or socioeconomic circumstances of this population of 20 million, and never has. Amazing as this may sound and scandalous though it may be, America has, at least to date, effectively banished this huge group—a group roughly twice the total size of our illegal-immigrant population and an adult population larger than that in any state but California—to a near-total and seemingly unending statistical invisibility. Our ex-cons are, so to speak, statistical outcasts who live in a darkness our polity does not care enough to illuminate—beyond the scope or interest of public policy, unless and until they next run afoul of the law.

Thus we cannot describe with any precision or certainty what has become of those who make up our “criminal class” after their (latest) sentencing or release. In the most stylized terms, however, we might guess that their odds in the real America are not all that favorable. And when we consider some of the other trends we have already mentioned—employment, health, addiction, welfare dependence—we can see the emergence of a malign new nationwide undertow, pulling downward against social mobility.

Social mobility has always been the jewel in the crown of the American mythos and ethos. The idea (not without a measure of truth to back it up) was that people in America are free to achieve according to their merit and their grit—unlike in other places, where they are trapped by barriers of class

or the misfortune of misrule. Nearly two decades into our new century, there are unmistakable signs that America's fabled social mobility is in trouble—perhaps even in serious trouble.

Consider the following facts. First, according to the Census Bureau, geographical mobility in America has been on the decline for three decades, and in 2016 the annual movement of households from one location to the next was reportedly at an all-time (postwar) low. Second, as a study by three Federal Reserve economists and a Notre Dame colleague demonstrated last year, “labor market fluidity”—the churning between jobs that among other things allows people to get ahead—has been on the decline in the American labor market for decades, with no sign as yet of a turnaround. Finally, and not least important, a December 2016 report by the “Equal Opportunity Project,” a team led by the formidable Stanford economist Raj Chetty, calculated that the odds of a 30-year-old's earning more than his parents at the same age was now just 51 percent: down from 86 percent 40 years ago. Other researchers who have examined the same data argue that the odds may not be quite as low as the Chetty team concludes, but agree that the chances of surpassing one's parents' real income have been on the downswing and are probably lower now than ever before in postwar America.

Thus the bittersweet reality of life for real Americans in the early 21st century: Even though the American economy still remains the world's unrivaled engine of wealth generation, those outside the bubble may have less of a shot at the American Dream than has been the case for decades, maybe generations—possibly even since the Great Depression.

The funny thing is, people inside the bubble are forever talking about “economic inequality,” that wonderful seminar construct, and forever virtue-signaling about how personally opposed they are to it. By contrast, “economic insecurity” is akin to a phrase from an unknown language. But if we were somehow to find a “Google Translate” function for communicating from real America into the bubble, an important message might be conveyed:

The abstraction of “inequality” doesn't matter a lot to ordinary Americans. The reality of economic insecurity does. The Great American Escalator is broken—and it badly needs to be fixed.

With the election of 2016, Americans within the bubble finally learned that the 21st century has gotten off to a very bad start in America. Welcome to the reality. We have a lot of work to do together to turn this around.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a distinguished member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, the other day, a young man who lives in my neighborhood came over, and he asked me to try to teach him how to drive a car. And I told him: Son, it is real easy to drive a car. It is just kind of like these budget proposals you will see in Congress. If you want to go forward and do things down the road, you put the car in D, like Democrat, for drive, and your car will go forward. But if you want to go backwards and reverse back to the 1950s, you put it in R, like a Republican.

He learned quick, and that is what these budgets are about. If you want to

go forward, you go with the Democratic budget—forward on building highways, school construction, broadband expansion; research, research on the deadly diseases that are killing each and every one of us and our children in time to come, and research by the National Institutes of Health that are cut by the budget. There is nothing more important that can be in the budget than moneys for the National Institutes of Health, yet they are being cut. Cancer, Alzheimer's, AIDS, stroke, diabetes, all are going to come at us and our relatives.

Some will say, and I said this one time before, and Mr. Kingston on the other side said: Well, our children and our grandchildren will have to pay for it. Who do you think is going to get the cures and the treatments? Our children and our grandchildren and generations to come.

And they cut research. They cut opportunities for America. You talk about taxes and the debt, the Republican plan gives billionaires the biggest cuts in history, over \$50 billion with estate tax elimination for people like the Koch brothers and the Waltons and all those folks, and that money will never come back.

The alternative minimum tax is eliminated. That is the only thing that made clear that President Trump paid any taxes in the only tax return we know about. If it weren't for that, he wouldn't have paid anything. We are talking multimillion- and billion-dollar tax cuts for the richest that create deficits in the future, but that is okay when it is giving money to those who already have it.

Franklin Roosevelt was right. You judge a society not by what it does for those who have an abundance, but you judge it by what it does for those who have the least.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do want to say to my good friend and colleague from Tennessee that I think the D stands for debt for Democrats, and I think the R stands for Republicans and recovery.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished chairwoman of the Budget Committee for her outstanding work.

My friend from Tennessee talks about driving forward. I think we need to pump the brakes. You are driving right off a cliff with this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition. It is my strong belief that our Nation has a debt crisis on its hand, and I am astonished by how many people on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, just refuse to acknowledge the problem. It is as if the problem doesn't exist.

Under their plan, taxes are going to be raised nearly \$3 trillion. We are

going to continue to raise spending to the tune of over \$6 trillion. We will have a meager \$2.6 billion in deficit reduction, by the way, compared to our budget that does well over \$6 trillion in deficit reduction.

Our Nation is \$20 trillion in debt, and it is a complete absurdity to think that we could begin to relinquish this process if we enacted such a burdensome budgetary proposal that is being offered by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

This budget would also diminish our national security apparatus. It would end the global war on terrorism fund by 2019. Let's go ahead and telegraph that we are going to end the global war on terrorism fund by 2019. The only people who I know who would support that would be our adversaries.

It seeks to promote the collapsing Affordable Care Act by keeping those burdensome mandates in place. This resolution before us right now refuses to do anything about the runaway entitlement programs that are the primary drivers of the deficit and debt in the country.

Mr. Chairman, their budget just will never balance. Never.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1030

Mrs. BLACK. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WOMACK. It will give no reconciliation instruction so that we can finally get control and protect for long-term sustainability the social safety net program that many depend on.

The bottom line is, you either acknowledge we have a deficit and a debt crisis, or you do not. And if you believe as I do, you will refuse this budget, and you will support ours.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I rise in support of the Democratic budget alternative and in opposition to the Republican budget that has been proposed.

It has been often said that gracious living and good politics is all about gratitude. Paying something forward is how you show your gratitude.

Quite frankly, the simple truth about this Republican budget is that it rolls back a century of progress. It sets the stage for the dismantling of Social Security, which lifted more people out of poverty than anything, and for Speaker RYAN's plan to turn it over to Wall Street.

It sets the stage for turning Medicare over to the insurance industry—Medicare that provided our elderly with insurance and life opportunities that heretofore had not existed.

This century of progress that this budget rolls back includes clean air and water. It includes healthy, safe working places and conditions. It in-

cludes an opportunity society that invests in our people.

And guess what? In a little over a century, we doubled life expectancies. Wow, what a marvelous accomplishment.

We created the best and biggest middle class in the history of the world. We became a model for the world; jobs with living wages and healthcare benefits and pension benefits.

This Republican budget proposes to roll back that entire century of progress. It is nothing about paying it forward. It is nothing about paying things back. It is about rolling back a century of progress, and we can not let that happen.

That is what the Democratic budget is really all about, investing in people, investing in infrastructure, investing in America, and investing in people's jobs and living wages, and in their benefits. That is how you show your gratitude, and we have got a lot to be grateful for.

Let's vote and enact this Democratic budget proposal which invests in America, which invests in people, which invests in opportunities. That is what this debate is really all about.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I saw recently, and I remember Ronald Reagan said something when he finally got his tax reform package done back in 1986—why it took so long and why it was so difficult. And at the end the day, he said: You know, the lawmakers and the policymakers forgot one important factor in their calculations that brought us to this point; they forgot to include what the American people have to say about this.

That is what is happening here today, Mr. Chairman. The American people have told us they want economic growth. They want opportunities for their kids and their families, a better quality of life. They want Washington to live within its means and stop taking more and more and more from them out of their paychecks.

So let's do a little bit of comparison. Let's look at, my colleagues, the Democrat budget. It raises taxes by \$2.7 trillion, compared to the CBO January baseline. That is almost \$3.8 trillion more than revenue levels in our House Republican budget. It increases spending by \$6.2 trillion, compared to the Republican budget over that 10-year period. It increases the debt held by the public by \$3.9 trillion, almost \$4 trillion relative to the House Republican budget.

And what is important, Mr. Chair, it never balances. There is not even an attempt to balance; not to mention that there are no reconciliation instructions that would give us an opportunity to deal with healthcare and other economic growth reforms.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a responsible budget that is being offered by

our colleagues on the other side. I urge my colleagues to oppose it and to support the House Republican budget later today.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his astute analysis on what the American people really want. I thank the manager, the chairwoman of this bill, and I acknowledge the position that they take.

But what America really wants is for Washington, for America, for the government, to stand by them in their time of need.

I am very grateful to be part of a party that is not about politics but is about values. We are the better choice party. We offer a better deal on this project that we have worked so hard on called the American budget.

The American budget, in contrast to our friends on the other side of the aisle, recognizes, as I visited the National Institutes for Health, that 80 percent of their budget that we are going to lose goes for research and researchers—looking those researchers in the eyes when they explain the research in medical science to help save lives, and to know that the Republican budget cuts the NIH, the Centers for Disease Control, and takes up the TrumpCare that cuts trillions in Medicaid and \$500 billion in Medicare. That is the story of this bill.

Then, as my good friend from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) indicated, we invest in infrastructure, and we help this young man, not only with his healthcare but with education. Do we realize how many jobs go unable to find individuals in this country? Hundreds of thousands because of the lack of training.

So if my friends want growth, you know how you get growth? You invest in the American people. Or you tell the American people when tragedies strike, whether it is the Virgin Islands, or Puerto Rico, or Florida, or Texas, or tragically, in Nevada, that you will stand by them. You provide them with the infrastructure to be able to overcome.

Not the Republican budget, because the Republican budget is giving trillions in tax cuts, and the distribution of those moneys will not see the front door of low-income, moderate-income, middle class working Americans.

That is the distinction between the Democratic budget. It increases opportunity through a higher minimum wage. It believes in equal pay for equal work. It knows that immigration reform will bring in billions of dollars. It will create opportunities for work.

Then, of course, we know that the Democratic budget strengthens our healthcare, and it provides that her Social Security, her Medicare, will not be in jeopardy. The Medicare trust fund

will not lose with a Republican budget and the trillions of dollars of tax cuts, her life, as she continues to seek some balance of good life will be lost.

We are the right direction. We are for the American people. We are standing by the American people with the Democratic budget. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Democratic alternative.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Tennessee, the chair of the Budget Committee, for the wonderful work she has done on bringing us to this position.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute amendment.

As chair of the Education and the Workforce Committee, my priority this Congress is to ensure that our policies promote a climate of job creation through economic growth, a sound fiscal policy, and a global economic competitiveness.

Our budget helps achieve all of these priorities by laying the foundation for a robust and comprehensive simplification of our burdensome Tax Code. The Democrat substitute not only fails to do so but would decimate America's workforce.

Our budget reforms our broken Tax Code so that it works for every American at every income level, regardless of where they live or how much money they earn.

The top U.S. tax rate for individuals has been as high as 90 percent and as low as 28 percent. At the same time, income tax revenue has remained fairly steady, despite these sharp rate swings. It turns out that the biggest driver of Federal revenue is not higher tax rates but economic growth.

In fact, a sizeable majority of economists point out that a broad base and low rates are key in a tax system that fosters economic growth and competitiveness. Legislators on both sides of the aisle agree on this basic principle, and history has shown it to be true.

Instead of raising taxes, we should, instead, embrace the policies contained in this budget resolution that encourages economic growth, like reducing regulatory burdens, welfare reform, and comprehensive tax reform for all individuals, not just a select few.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise, as well, in opposition to the substitute amendment, and I do so because I am struck by the ways in which you can, at times, agree on the diagnosis but disagree on the cure.

I think we would all agree, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we have a real problem in the way that

wages have indeed stagnated over the last 30 years. A lot of my Democratic colleagues are nailing it in terms of that diagnosis.

The question though, is the cure. And the question there is: Can we fix that problem by raising taxes by \$2.7 trillion? Can we fix that problem by increasing spending by \$6.2 trillion? Can we fix that problem by increasing the debt by \$3.9 trillion and, in essence, having a budget that never balances?

I would argue, no, and I would say, instead, what we have to look at is the basics, which we have been dancing around, which is the mathematic formula that says: Savings drives investment, which drives productivity gain which, ultimately, impacts standard of living or wages. And what we don't focus on enough is this notion of the investment part of investment; if you want to increase productivity, you have got to increase investment.

In fairness to my Democratic colleagues, part of that is public investment, but another part is private.

What my colleague from Virginia was just getting at a moment ago was, for 50 years, regardless of tax rate, 90 or 28 percent, the take to government has been about 18 percent of GDP very consistently.

So what I would argue is we, indeed, need more public investment, but we also need private investment to go with it. And if we don't watch out, what is being contemplated with this Democratic substitute is a process that will ultimately crowd out that much more in the way of private investment so key to increasing productivity.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, it is clear that we have a very different budget and a very different understanding of the challenges facing our country. We see that so many Americans are working harder and longer and can't remember the last time they got a raise.

We know families are worried about how to pay for college, or if their parents' retirement is secure, or if they will ever be able to afford to stop working. And we know that trillions of dollars in tax cuts for millionaires and large corporations will turn these fears of hardworking Americans families into reality.

□ 1045

Just a few minutes ago, my Republican colleague from Ohio talked about what the American people want. On many of those things, we agree. But I know one thing the American people don't want. They don't want massive tax cuts for the top 1 percent of Americans.

The Democratic budget rejects tax cuts for the wealthy. We invest in programs that will grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, provide real support for working families and real security in retirement. We make education

and childcare more affordable, and we support policies to help every American get the healthcare that they need.

Those are the priorities of our budget, and they are the priorities of the American people.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I look into my children's and grandchildren's eyes, and I say: I want you to know that right now you owe \$63,000 for your part of the debt of this country.

What we are doing in Congress right now, if we were to vote on and accept this amendment, we would be increasing that burden on our children and grandchildren.

I, for one, cannot do that, and I think that we have got to be responsible. We have got to look at how we in this country can get back to the place, as has already been said, that we ask families and businesses to do, and that is to live within their means.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 268, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

AYES—156

Adams	Davis, Danny	Kaptur
Aguilar	DeFazio	Keating
Barragan	DeGette	Kelly (IL)
Bass	DeLauro	Kennedy
Beatty	DelBene	Khanna
Beyer	Demings	Kildee
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Kilmer
Blumenauer	Deuth	Langevin
Blunt Rochester	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Bonamici	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Boyle, Brendan	Ellison	Lawrence
F.	Engel	Lawson (FL)
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Lee
Brown (MD)	Español	Levin
Butterfield	Esty (CT)	Lewis (GA)
Capuano	Evans	Lieu, Ted
Carbajal	Frankel (FL)	Lofgren
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Lowenthal
Carson (IN)	Gallego	Lowey
Cartwright	Garamendi	Lujan Grisham,
Castor (FL)	Gomez	M.
Castro (TX)	Gonzalez (TX)	Luján, Ben Ray
Chu, Judy	Green, Al	Lynch
Ciilline	Green, Gene	Maloney,
Clark (MA)	Grijalva	Carolyn B.
Clarke (NY)	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Clay	Hanabusa	McCollum
Cleaver	Hastings	McEachin
Clyburn	Heck	McGovern
Cohen	Higgins (NY)	McNerney
Connolly	Hoyer	Meeks
Conyers	Huffman	Meng
Correa	Jackson Lee	Moore
Courtney	Jayapal	Moulton
Crowley	Jeffries	Nadler
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Neal
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Nolan

Norcross	Sánchez
O'Rourke	Sarbanes
Pallone	Schakowsky
Panetta	Schiff
Pascarell	Scott (VA)
Pelosi	Scott, David
Perlmutter	Serrano
Pingree	Sewell (AL)
Pocan	Shea-Porter
Polis	Sherman
Price (NC)	Sires
Quigley	Slaughter
Raskin	Smith (WA)
Roybal-Allard	Soto
Ruppersberger	Speier
Rush	Swalwell (CA)
Ryan (OH)	Takano

NOES—268

Abraham	Frelinghuysen
Aderholt	Fudge
Allen	Gaetz
Amash	Gallagher
Amodei	Garrett
Arrington	Gianforte
Babin	Gibbs
Bacon	Gohmert
Banks (IN)	Goodlatte
Barletta	Gosar
Barr	Gotthelmer
Barton	Gowdy
Bera	Granger
Bergman	Graves (GA)
Biggs	Graves (LA)
Bilirakis	Graves (MO)
Bishop (MI)	Griffith
Bishop (UT)	Grothman
Black	Guthrie
Blackburn	Handel
Blum	Harper
Bost	Harris
Brady (TX)	Hartzler
Brat	Hensarling
Brooks (AL)	Herrera Beutler
Brooks (IN)	Hice, Jody B.
Brownley (CA)	Higgins (LA)
Buchanan	Hill
Buck	Himes
Bucshon	Holding
Budd	Hollingsworth
Burgess	Hudson
Bustos	Huizenga
Byrne	Hultgren
Calvert	Hunter
Carter (GA)	Hurd
Carter (TX)	Issa
Chabot	Jenkins (KS)
Cheney	Jenkins (WV)
Coffman	Johnson (LA)
Cole	Johnson (OH)
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam
Collins (NY)	Jones
Comer	Jordan
Comstock	Joyce (OH)
Conaway	Katko
Cook	Kelly (MS)
Cooper	Kelly (PA)
Costa	Kind
Costello (PA)	King (IA)
Cramer	King (NY)
Crawford	Kinzinger
Crist	Knight
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi
Culberson	Kuster (NH)
Curbelo (FL)	Kustoff (TN)
Labrador	Labrador
Davis, Rodney	LaHood
Delaney	LaMalfa
Denham	Lamborn
Dent	Lance
DesJarlais	Latta
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (MN)
Donovan	Lipinski
Duffy	LoBiondo
Duncan (SC)	Loeb sack
Duncan (TN)	Long
Dunn	Loudermilk
Emmer	Love
Estes (KS)	Lucas
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer
Faso	MacArthur
Ferguson	Maloney, Sean
Fitzpatrick	Marchant
Fleischmann	Marino
Flores	Marshall
Fortenberry	Massie
Foster	Mast
Foxx	McCarthy
Franks (AZ)	McCaul

Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Tonko	Thompson (PA)
Torres	Thornberry
Tsongas	Tiberi
Vargas	Tipton
Veasey	Trott
Vela	Turner
Velázquez	Upton
Wasserman	Valadao
Schultz	Visclosky
Waters, Maxine	
Watson Coleman	
Welch	
Wilson (FL)	
Yarmuth	

Wagner	Walberg
Walder	Walker
Walorski	Walorski
Walters, Mimi	Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)	Webster (FL)
Wenstrup	Westerman

Williams	Wilson (SC)
Wittman	Womack
Woodall	Woodall
Yoder	Yoho
Young (AK)	Young (IA)
Young (IA)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

Bridenstine	Kihuen	Titus
DeSantis	Murphy (PA)	Walz
Doyle, Michael F.	Napolitano	
	Rosen	

□ 1111

Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. GAETZ, MARSHALL, MAST, BANKS of Indiana, and FRANKS of Arizona changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mses. VELÁZQUEZ, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. KEATING, and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. WALORSKI). Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the hard work the Budget Committee has put forth to produce a budget that prioritizes our national defense and sets forth bold policy reforms that will get this country back on track to fiscal responsibility.

Specifically, I am pleased to see that this budget commits to reducing the substantial amount of improper payments throughout the Federal Government. The Government Accountability Office estimates that there were \$144 billion—I want to emphasize \$144 billion—in improper payments in 2016 alone, and that is not even a complete estimate. In fact, 18 Federal programs did not report their improper payments, so the total is undoubtedly higher.

To make matters worse, since 2013, the amount we have been incorrectly sending out has been trending upwards. Instead of reducing our fraudulent payments, the rate at which we pay them out has been increasing. Since 2003, there has been a total of \$1.2 trillion in improper payments. Let me repeat, that is \$1.2 trillion plus interest.

□ 1115

Because we have been running deficits over that timeframe, we have literally had to borrow that money to send it to fraudsters and others who

would not have received it. This is unacceptable.

As you can see from this chart, this represents improper payments for 2016 alone. It is money borrowed that we pay interest on to send to people who are not supposed to get it. We are borrowing money and adding to our debt through improper payments.

This budget, for the first time, sets forth a bold strategy for cutting these payments in half over the budget window, saving us \$700 billion over our 10-year window.

While I hope, in the near future, we can zero these payments out, I am thrilled to see that we are beginning to tackle a problem that is putting an additional strain on this country's fiscal problems.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Madam Chairwoman, I suppose I should be saying thank you. I will get a huge tax cut under the Republican tax cut plan, as well the majority of those people sitting here—the majority of our colleagues in Congress—who are, like me, fortunate enough to be millionaires already.

Forgive me if I am in no mood to say thank you, because I was elected not just to represent millionaires, but to represent aspiring millionaires, working families, seniors, and veterans. For all of them, for anyone who isn't already a millionaire, this budget is a slap in the face.

With all of the problems facing our country right now, all the people struggling to get ahead, it is unfathomable to me that this Congress could look at people like me and say: Hey, that guy, let's give him more money. In fact, let's give all millionaires hundreds of thousands of dollars in tax cuts.

Really, I am small potatoes. President Trump, according to his financial disclosure, will get hundreds of millions of dollars in tax cuts.

Where is all that money coming from? If you are listening to this and you are not a millionaire, probably from you.

To pay for our own tax cuts and the tax cuts for wealthy donors, Republicans are going to increase taxes on 45 percent of American families with children. That is just the start. Seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income families will see their healthcare cut.

Poor seniors will lose benefits that help them keep food on the table and their homes heated in the winter. Veteran benefits, meals for hungry schoolchildren, programs that make education affordable and job training available, investments that generate economic growth and create good-paying jobs are all at risk in this budget.

They are also cutting corporate tax rates, which we will be paying for by plunging our Nation into deeper and deeper debt, giving multinational giants another advantage over small- and

mid-size businesses in the name of perpetuating the myth of supply-side economics.

Supply-side failed. They renamed it trickle-down, but nothing trickled down. Now it is job creators. When that fails, maybe they will call it "I get mine now; you get yours later—maybe." But whatever they name it, it is a sham. This plan is a hoax on the American people, and it will make most people's lives more difficult.

So forgive me if I am in no mood to say thank you for the extra money in my pocket. With millions of Americans struggling and scraping to get ahead, and with my tax cut increasing their challenges, I cannot begin to justify my extra money, and, quite frankly, I cannot fathom how my Republican colleagues are able to justify theirs.

With this budget, Republicans aren't just passing the buck, they are pocketing it. Madam Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Republican budget.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his great leadership as the ranking member on the Budget Committee in the House, and I thank all of the members of the Budget Committee for their great work to make the budget that was proposed earlier, the Yarmuth budget, a statement of our values. That is exactly what a budget should be.

A Federal budget should be a statement of our national values, and what is important to us as a country should be reflected in the priorities that we place into that budget. The budget before us, proposed by the Republicans, is just the opposite of that. It is accompanied by a tax proposal that they put in, one of the biggest transfers of wealth to the wealthiest people in our country in our country's history. Every time they do it, they make it worse.

I let you be the judge: Is a statement of our national values to cut a trillion dollars from Medicaid, cap and take Medicaid down a bad path, in order to give tax cuts to the richest people in our country?

Is it a statement of our values to take a half trillion dollars out of Medicare to give a tax cut to the wealthiest people in our country?

Our distinguished ranking member has listed some of the things that would be cut if we went down this unfortunate path posed by our colleagues on the other side.

This is a budget that steals from the middle class. It steals hundreds of billions of dollars from critical job-creating, wage-increasing investments, infrastructure, job training, and clean energy. It harms veterans, it cuts education, it abandons rural America, and it guts education.

This is really a mystery to me. When you cut education, with the stiff com-

petition we have, this is one of the worst budget decisions that you have made. Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than investing in education: early childhood, K-12, higher education, postgraduate, and lifetime learning for our workers.

That is how you grow the economy. That is how you bring money to the Treasury, and not by cutting it in order to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country.

Is it a statement of values to cut education so that you have a tax cut that benefits 80 percent?

I know you don't want the public to hear this, and I can understand why. How could it be a statement of the values of the American people to cut the education of our children in order to have a tax cut where 80 percent of it benefits the top 1 percent of people in our country? It is just not right.

As they do that, the deficit hawks, who seem to be an endangered species on the Republican side of the aisle these days, are adding close to \$2.4 trillion to the deficit, not counting debt service or interest on that national debt. Then they say: Oh, that is okay; we need to increase the national debt by trillions of dollars so that we can give tax cuts.

Where do the tax cuts go? \$2.6 trillion goes to corporate America.

Guess what happens to the middle class. There are \$470 billion in tax increases to the middle class, about a half trillion dollars in increases to the middle class, \$2.5 trillion in tax cuts for corporate America. Again, it is adding so much to the deficit.

Now they say: Oh, trickle-down economics is going to pay its own way. We will get that money back.

Not so. It never happens. Nonsense. But don't take it from me. No less a figure than Bruce Bartlett, who worked for Congressman Jack Kemp, a real supporter of supply-side economics—and, as was said, supply-side turn into trickle-down, et cetera. As a proponent of supply-side economics, he said: We never said it would pay for itself. We just advocate it as an economic approach.

But anyone who says, and this is from him, that the whole supply-side dynamic scoring pays for itself—part of this argument—is all nonsense. It is not true. He went on to say that it was bull—you finish the sentence.

So, here we are at a place where we can increase the deficit, decrease job creation, hurt the middle class, benefit the top 1 percent, and add to the national debt in historic proportions that will be very hard to collect from deficit hawks—if any of you exist over there.

Instead, we have an opportunity today for a better deal for the American people—better jobs, better pay, better wages, and a better future—where we lower costs for America's working families and middle class families, and where we prepare them with the tools for the economy of the 21st century.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chair of the Bourbon Caucus, for his great leadership in bringing a better budget that is a statement of our national values, that supports American workers with responsible tax reform, calls for parity between defense and nondefense, and strengthens the ACA and protects Medicare.

Every time the Republicans come to the floor and try to stack the deck even further for their wealthy friends, we have to have this conversation. Democrats will fight these tax cuts and this unfortunate, deceptive budget that they have on the floor. I urge my colleagues to start by voting “no” today and to continue the conversation with the American people to fight this unfortunate path they want to take us down: the road to ruin.

I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chairman, I am going to be brief in my closing comments.

I do want to ask my colleague to consider this: Are we proud of a country where we are leaving our children and grandchildren in further and further debt?

During our discussion in this Chamber, we have shared our ideas for building a better America, an America that we would be proud to entrust to future generations. While it requires confronting real challenges along the road ahead, it is, undoubtedly, worth the journey.

First, our budget forces the Federal Government to live within its means, just like hardworking Americans and small businesses do on a daily basis.

Second, our budget identifies wasteful spending and finds much-needed savings and reforms for unsustainable mandatory spending. In fact, our committee has put forward the largest reform package for mandatory programs that has been seen in 20 years.

Third, it calls for a robust funding of our military, ensuring the resources that will allow us to be ready and protect our mainland. It also starts the process of restoring our military readiness, which suffered dramatically during the Obama administration.

Finally, our budget is the golden key that unlocks progrowth tax reform and takes us one step further to the great ideas unveiled in the framework last week.

Without question, our budget plan reflects American values and shared priorities. I urge my colleagues to join me in their support for a win for all Americans, because doing so will begin to ensure a brighter and better future for generations to come, and I urge a “yes” vote.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE) having assumed the chair, Mrs. WALORSKI, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, and, pursuant to House Resolution 553, she reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is adoption of the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Members will record their votes by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 206, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

YEAS—219

Abraham	Duncan (TN)	Joyce (OH)
Aderholt	Dunn	Kelly (MS)
Allen	Emmer	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Estes (KS)	King (IA)
Arrington	Farenthold	Kinzinger
Babin	Faso	Knight
Bacon	Ferguson	Kustoff (TN)
Banks (IN)	Fleischmann	Labrador
Barletta	Flores	LaHood
Barr	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Barton	Foxx	Lamborn
Bergman	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Biggs	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (MN)
Bilirakis	Gaetz	Long
Bishop (MI)	Gallagher	Loudermilk
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Love
Black	Gianforte	Lucas
Blackburn	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer
Bost	Gohmert	MacArthur
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Marchant
Brat	Gosar	Marino
Brooks (AL)	Gowdy	Marshall
Brooks (IN)	Granger	McCarthy
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Bucshon	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Budd	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Burgess	Griffith	McMorris
Byrne	Grothman	Rodgers
Calvert	Guthrie	McSally
Carter (GA)	Handel	Meadows
Carter (TX)	Harper	Messer
Chabot	Harris	Mitchell
Cheney	Hartzler	Moolenaar
Coffman	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Mullin
Collins (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse
Collins (NY)	Higgins (LA)	Noem
Comer	Hill	Norman
Conaway	Holding	Nunes
Cook	Hollingsworth	Olson
Cramer	Hudson	Palazzo
Crawford	Huizenga	Palmer
Culberson	Hultgren	Paulsen
Curbelo (FL)	Hunter	Pearce
Davidson	Hurd	Perry
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Pittenger
Denham	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
DesJarlais	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (LA)	Posey
Donovan	Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe
Duffy	Johnson, Sam	Reed
Duncan (SC)	Jordan	Reichert

Renacci	Scott, Austin	Valadao
Rice (SC)	Sensenbrenner	Wagner
Roby	Sessions	Walberg
Roe (TN)	Shimkus	Walden
Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Walker
Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Walorski
Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Walters, Mimi
Rokita	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
Rooney, Francis	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Rooney, Thomas J.	Smucker	Wenstrup
Roskam	Stefanik	Westerman
Ross	Stewart	Williams
Rothfus	Stivers	Wilson (SC)
Rouzer	Taylor	Wittman
Royce (CA)	Tenney	Womack
Russell	Thompson (PA)	Woodall
Rutherford	Thornberry	Yoder
Ryan (WI)	Tiberi	Yoho
Sanford	Tipton	Young (AK)
Scalise	Trott	Young (IA)
Schweikert	Turner	Zeldin
	Upton	

NAYS—206

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

NOT VOTING—9

Bridenstine	Kihuen	Titus
DeSantis	Murphy (PA)	Walz
Doyle, Michael F.	Napolitano Rosen	

□ 1148

Mr. HOYER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during roll call votes No. 556 through 557 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on the Yarmuth of Kentucky Substitute Amendment No. 4, and no on final passage of the Budget Resolution.

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.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House on account of Columbus Day. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act, sponsored by Senator RON JOHNSON. Dr. Kirkpatrick was a psychologist who was fired from the VA medical center where he worked after raising concerns about patients' medications. He committed suicide the day he was fired.

This bill will enhance whistleblower protections while ensuring supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers

are punished. I look forward to the House passing this bill and continuing our work to fundamentally change the culture of the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I also expect the House to make a motion to go to conference on the National Defense Authorization Act.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I expect the House to consider an additional supplemental package to assist the ongoing recovery efforts following Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, will the supplemental that the gentleman mentioned—which is, as I understand, approximately \$29 billion, which will take care of forest fires in the West; \$16 billion, as I understand it, in debt relief, which will raise the borrowing level for FEMA; and then, of course, money directly for the victims of the hurricanes. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there will be any, what I will call, extraneous matters that might be controversial, or will this be a straight supplemental without controversy? We all want to make sure that we have the resources to help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is correct. The White House has sent up a supplemental, and I do not believe this will be the last of the supplementals, based on the damage that has been done from the numerous hurricanes. But, yes, there will be more money for the Disaster Relief Fund to help throughout Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

As you know, too, the West had devastating forest fires, so there is roughly \$577 million there. And the National Flood Insurance Program has hit a ceiling. To deal with all of the flooding that has gone on, we have to deal with that, as well.

The Appropriations Committee has just received that last night. They are working through it now. I don't intend on seeing other things with it. I look forward to the Member working with me on that to make sure we get it right from what the President has asked.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his thought that there will not be anything in there that would make it a partisan bill. I think, as the President sent it down, it is, obviously, something that we need to do quickly and in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader and I have talked about the Dream Act. Another week has gone by and, therefore, the 6-month deadline is closer, and the President has urged us to pass legislation.

Can the gentleman tell me what the expectations are to address the Dream Act?

As you know, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, has filed a discharge

petition on the bill sponsored by LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. Can the gentleman tell me what progress we are making on that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, we are dealing with the DACA situation and the situation along the border.

As you know, the Speaker has put together a task force. They have met numerous times. I have had dinner with the President just this week dealing with this issue, and you and I have talked, as well.

I think the best way to solve this problem, to make sure we get to the root cause, we have to secure the border, we have to deal with DACA, and, more importantly, I think we do it in a manner where we are all working together.

I am, as you know, not a fan of a discharge petition. I think the best way to handle this is continuing to work through the matter with the committees—and on your side of the aisle, as well—to solve this problem. The President gave us 6 months. I would like to get this done before then.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Let me, if I might, Mr. Speaker, simply suggest to the gentleman, we certainly understand, and this side agrees, we want to have secure borders. There is, obviously, a disagreement on the President's proposal of a wall, I think, frankly, on your side as well as on my side of the aisle. I would hope that we would not, in effect, hold hostage the 800,000 students, workers, and young people brought here as children who know no other country.

In my discussions with Mr. RYAN, and his public comments have indicated, he is sympathetic to making sure that we address that issue. He urged, as you know, President Trump not to rescind DACA. The President did anyway.

I am hopeful that we can deal with the DREAMers, which I think certainly has very robust support on both sides of the aisle, in my view, Mr. Leader. I hope we can deal with that without clouding it with an issue, i.e., the wall. Not security; security I think we can reach agreement on. But I am hopeful that we can do that.

The DREAMers are extraordinarily anxious. I presume you have met with some of the DREAMers. They are really very impressive people and are enhancing our communities and our country.

So I would hope that we could do that. I look forward to talking to you personally about how we move forward and, hopefully, move quickly. I would like to have done it by next week.

As you know, I said that it would be nice to do it in this work period, to lay to rest the anxiety of the 800,000-plus people who will be affected. But, if we can't do that, certainly I would hope that we could do it shortly after we get back after the next district work period.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2017, TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1200

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, it is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Every day, nearly 1,000 women in this country receive a life-changing diagnosis that they will be affected by breast cancer. Nearly 200,000 of these diagnoses occur each year. One in eight women in our country will face breast cancer.

Breast cancer has a devastating effect on our families, taking away wives, mothers, aunts, uncles, sisters, and daughters.

I wish I was a brilliant scientist and could develop a cure. I wish I was a magician and could wave a magic wand and cure breast cancer, but I am just a Member of Congress. Actually, there are things this Congress could do to make breast cancer less likely, less deadly, and less painful.

Cannabis has shown promise in cancer research for over 2 decades. This research finally came to fruition in 2007, when Dr. Sean McAllister showed that cannabis-related compounds helped fight malignant forms of breast cancer. In the decade since, other research has confirmed and built on Dr. McAllister's findings, and there is now conclusive research that shows that cannabis-related compounds have antitumor properties.

Yet, despite these findings, scientists are going too slow. It is time for cannabis research to begin, and we should declassify it as a schedule I drug.

LOCKING PEOPLE UP WITHOUT DUE PROCESS IS UN-AMERICAN

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, this week, Congressman ADAM SMITH and I

introduced the Dignity for Detained Immigrants Act. This legislation is critical to dismantle President Trump's mass deportation machine, to protect families, and to restore justice and due process to our broken immigration system.

Our detention system brings huge profits for large private corporations. About 38,000 people are detained every single day at a cost to taxpayers of over \$2 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about two things: dignity and justice for families, pregnant women, people with serious illnesses, survivors of torture and violence. It is unconscionable that we are detaining these people sometimes for months or even years.

Congress can't afford to sit on the sidelines anymore. It is time to make clear that locking people up without due process is not only unconstitutional, it is un-American.

At a time when net migration is zero, when DREAMers are at risk of losing their DACA status, and the world reels from unprecedented numbers of refugees fleeing for their lives, we must act with compassion.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Dignity for Detained Immigrants Act, and I thank the over 55 cosponsors who have already come on to this piece of legislation.

GUN CONTROL DOESN'T WORK

(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, within minutes of the tragic shooting in Las Vegas, Democrats and the liberal media called for more gun control measures.

A recent Washington Post op-ed describes how one gun control advocate researched restrictive gun laws in Great Britain and in Australia, only to discover that gun buybacks and gun bans do not reduce mass shootings or gun-related crimes.

She said: "The case for the"—gun control—"policies I had lobbied for crumbled when I examined the evidence. . . . But I can't endorse policies whose only selling point is that gun owners hate them. Policies that often seem as if they were drafted by people who have encountered guns only as a figure in a briefing book or an image on the news."

This researcher concluded that more lives would be saved by focusing on individuals instead of guns.

We should ensure that background checks work as intended and prevent those with mental health issues from acquiring guns. This actually will do some good, as opposed to meaningless gun regulations.

CONGRESS MUST REAUTHORIZE THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the swift reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

CHIP helps families provide care for their children. Throughout our Nation, it covers 9 million children and pregnant women. In California, it covers 2 million children. And in my district, half of the kids get their healthcare from Medicaid or CHIP.

Now, CHIP was implemented over 20 years ago, championed by two Senators on opposite sides of the political spectrum, ORRIN HATCH and Ted Kennedy, and it has continued to receive strong bipartisan support. But because of inaction by the House of Representatives, because of the distractions by this administration, millions of our children may be denied coverage.

They may not get to see their doctors for routine checkups. With the upcoming flu season, kids may not be able to get the necessary care when they are sick, and children with allergies may not have access to lifesaving medications and health services.

If this Congress does not step up to fix this mistake before it is too late, children will pay the price of our inaction.

Congress must take action to come together to pass CHIP for the millions of kids who continue to depend on us for this healthcare.

HELP IS ON THE WAY TO PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I sit as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs that deals directly with the jurisdiction of Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and other territories of the U.S.

We had a very good briefing this week led by JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN from Puerto Rico, as well as STACEY PLASKETT of the Virgin Islands. It was very important information. As we all know of the difficult situation, especially we are seeing so much in Puerto Rico as well as the Virgin Islands; President Trump visiting Puerto Rico this week.

Help is on the way. Indeed, it has been on the way, and we need to just keep pushing to rebuild that infrastructure and push out into the islands where the need is still felt.

So we know, we see, we are aware, and we will keep working to achieve positive results in the short term as well, as we look at the situation with Puerto Rico and the difficulty with PREPA, the power company, and other

issues that we will address as a committee in order to have a long-term, positive solution for the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico and what they need.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO BEGIN WORK ON GUN SAFETY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, many of us will be going home to our districts, facing constituents who will be asking the question: Why?

It really is painful when fellow Americans lose their lives. It is painful as we watch our soldiers go off into battle, and many of them do not come home in any other way but as a fallen soldier.

This past week, Americans, who were not in battle but were enjoying the life and the liberty of this Nation, fell by a murderous actor. I think we will have to go home and comfort our constituents, and we will also tell them what we are going to do.

I don't know why we have to climb this high mountain of understanding that laws can make a difference; not end all violence, but make a difference: legislation that says that guns have to be locked to save the lives of children; gun legislation that deals with banning armor-piercing bullets that would harm and injure our first responders; and then to get rid of the kits that this murderous individual utilized to make a semiautomatic an automatic.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress, together, to begin to do work on gun safety that will save American lives. I go home to my district to meet with my constituents, and I am going to tell them that I am going to do something that makes sense for the American people.

UNDERSTANDING WHAT LATE-TERM ABORTION IS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Chamber took up H.R. 36, a bill dealing with pain-capable unborn children; and a bill that, in its result, would cause the United States to join the vast bulk of nations in the world wherein the termination of lives of children who are not only capable of feeling pain, but under what we understand to be the best science may, in fact, feel more pain because of the density of the nerve tissue, as they are in this roughly fifth month of development.

I guess four times in the brief time that I have been in this building, we have seen the Chamber erupt into applause, oftentimes over partisan-perceived victories.

The first time the Chamber erupted into applause is when my colleagues

across the aisle were giddy with joy when a bill that would have ensured that the Department of Defense didn't spend money to perform transgender procedures on soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines failed in the form of an amendment. Another had to do with healthcare. Another had to do with the return of Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE. That was indeed a bipartisan eruption in applause.

Then there was an eruption from this side of the Chamber when H.R. 36 passed, as there was a recognition that late-term abortion is barbaric and counter to the ideas put forth to the world when, in the Declaration of Independence, it was written that we hold certain truths to be self-evident, and among those was life.

Too many people have failed to grasp the nature of what late-term abortion is, yet to grapple with the problem will require to understand what exactly that problem is.

So to look at the other six nations in the world that allow the termination of life after 5 months, we see nations like Vietnam, North Korea, China, and the United States.

Then to listen to the doctors who have performed these procedures describe in what was literally excruciating detail how the procedure is performed, that an instrument is inserted into the uterus, and probing is done until something is found, and the instrument is latched on, and then there is pulling, and out comes an arm or a leg or a piece of a head or a torso. Then, in fact, that unborn child, who science tells us can feel pain, dies by virtue of bleeding to death inside its very host. That is the nature of these procedures.

Estimates tell us that if the United States joined the fast bulk of the nations on the planet in outlawing late-term abortions, somewhere between 14,000 and 20,000 children every year wouldn't experience an unspeakable demise of literally being ripped from their host limb by limb and bleeding to death, all whilst, in the best estimates of scientists, feeling the pain of that death.

To put that in terms of Virginia's Fifth District, that is the population of Cumberland County twice every year, roughly.

So there was applause from the Members who saw that the United States would join the ranks of the civilized nations in the world who put appropriate value on life, Mr. Speaker, and disappointment from some on the other side of the aisle, other than a few brave individuals to be distinguished by departing from the herd and recognizing the value and sanctity of life thereto, and immediate news stories about how H.R. 36 was dead on arrival in the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the American people will not let that be the case.

I often speak of the history of the Fifth District of Virginia that gave us

great Americans like Booker T. Washington and Barbara Johns, Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, James Madison, James Monroe, and Patrick Henry.

As I thought about how to best address the need for action in the other Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I determined that there were no better words than those delivered by Patrick Henry from Virginia, slightly amended, on March 23, 1775, in St. John's Cathedral as he addressed the second Virginia Assembly in Richmond, Virginia.

So with all credit to the author, whom I paraphrase, I would read: Mr. Speaker, no man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism and abilities of the very worthy people who have served and do serve in this Senate.

□ 1215

But different people often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be a thought disrespectful to those Senators if entertaining, as I do, opinions of a character very opposite of many of theirs, I shall speak forth of my sentiments freely and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony.

The question before the Senate is one of an awful consequence to this country. For my part, I consider it nothing less than a question of life or death, and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject, ought to be the freedom of debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to our creator and country.

Should I keep back my opinions at such times through a fear of giving offense or political loss? I should consider myself guilty of treason and of cowardice, an act of disloyalty towards the majesty of our creator, who I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. Speaker, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against painful truth and listen to the song of the siren until she transforms us into beasts. Is this the role of wise people engaged in a great and arduous struggle for life? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation?

For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth, to know the worst, and to provide for it. I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience, of history. I have no way of judging the future but by the past.

In judging the past, I wish to know for what has been the conduct of the abortion industry for the last 44 years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen are pleased to solace themselves.

The Senate, is that insidious smile which our petition has been received lately? Trust it not, sir. It will prove a snare at your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with the promise

of later action. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with these nearly 60 million lives lost in this country alone, which cover our waters and darken our lands. Is taking an unborn life a work of love and reconciliation? Is subjecting to pain a 5-month-old child as no other nation save six on the Earth allowed to happen? Let us not deceive ourselves. These are the implements of death and destruction.

I ask what means this perpetual delay of voting? What is its purpose? What is the force of inaction? Can gentlemen assign another possible motive for it than to ensure that it never occurs?

Destruction? No, sir, destruction. They are set to send and perpetuate this loss of life, and have so long supported this loss of life, and now an opportunity presents itself to vote, and what do we have to oppose inaction? Mr. Speaker, we have our voices. Shall we try again and again? Shall we bring this bill back next year? We have been trying that for 40 years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing.

We have held this subject in every light of which it is capable. It has all been, to this date, in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and supplication? What terms shall we find that have not already been exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, Mr. Speaker, deceive ourselves.

We have done everything that we could do to avert this death that has claimed nearly 60 million lives and 14 to 20 million unborn lives after the age of 5 months in utero every single year. We have petitioned, we have remonstrated, we have supplicated, we have prostrated ourselves and have implored its inner position to arrest the tyrannical hands of the abortion industry and its champions in Washington, and our petitions have been slighted. Our remonstrations produce additional death and insult. Our supplications have been disregarded, and we have been spurned with contempt from the floor of the Chamber of the opposing body. In vain these things we may indulge the fond hope of life and justice.

If we support life, if we mean to preserve and violate this fundamental right for which we have been so long arguing, if we mean not basely to abandon this noble struggle which we have been so long engaged in, in which we have pledged ourselves to never abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained, we must hope the American people demand the Senate hold a vote. We must hope the American people demand the Senate hold a vote.

An appeal to democracy and to the Lord of hosts is all that is left to us. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a promise of later action. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with the nearly 60 million lives ended.

We can be heard in numbers across the fruited plain. A vote should be held

for or against life. Let us have it. Let us have it. In this vein, sir, to extenuate the matter, gentlemen may cry: Later; later; next year. But there is no later. The killing has continued for over 40 years. The next gale that sweeps to the North will bring to our ears cries of the yet born. The House has voted. Why is the Senate idle? What is it that they wish? What would they have? Is political victory so dear or a title so sweet as to be purchased at the price of human life? Forbid it, Almighty God.

Mr. Speaker, I know not what course others may take, but as for me, my hope is that there is a vote. My hope is that we stand for life.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for October 4 after 8 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Ms. ROSEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of work in district relating to tragic shooting in Las Vegas.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 178. An act to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 652. A act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 6, 2017, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2774. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Persimmons From New Zealand Into the United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0052] (RIN: 0579-AE26) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2775. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a deter-

mination that a negotiated comprehensive subcontracting plan did not meet the subcontracting goals negotiated in their prior fiscal year, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 637 note; Public Law 114-92, Sec. 872(d)(2); (129 Stat. 939); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2776. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that in FY 2017 and FY 2018, the Department proposed no military construction projects under the Sec. 2803(c)(1) of the Defense Laboratory Modernization Pilot Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2777. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's report on the Availability of Credit to Small Businesses, September 2017, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 252(a)(1); Public Law 104-208, Sec. 2227(a)(1); (110 Stat. 3009-417); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2778. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2779. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2780. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2781. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2782. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Office of the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding Among the Department of Defense of Australia, and the Ministry of Defence of the Kingdom of Denmark and the Department of Defense of the United States of America, Transmittal No. 01-17, pursuant to Sec. 27(f) of the Arms Export Act, and Executive Order 13637; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2783. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report entitled "Report of U.S. Persons Expropriation Claims and Certain Other Commercial and Investment Disputes", dated October 2017, pursuant to Sec. 527(f) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, Public Law 103-236 dated October 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2784. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of

Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-44, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2785. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations to Include the Continuation of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 13222 [Docket No.: 170316279-7279-01] (RIN: 0694-AH38) received October 4, 2017, 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.

2786. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Significant Improvements Needed in DCRA Management of Vacant and Blighted Property Program", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 455(d); (87 Stat. 803); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2787. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Endowment's FY 2017 Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities Inventory, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2788. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's annual submission regarding agency compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and revised Office of Management and Budget Circular A-123; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2789. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Unified Listing Team, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Pearl Darter [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2016-0037; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BB55) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2790. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Negotiated Non-competitive Agreements for the Use of Sand, Gravel, and/or Shell Resources on the Outer Continental Shelf [Docket ID: BOEM-2010-0041] (RIN: 1010-AD90) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2791. A letter from the Acting Manager, Species Assessment Team, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Guadalupe Fescue; Designation of Critical Habitat for Guadalupe Fescue [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0099 and FWS-R2-ES-2016-0100; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BA74) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2792. A letter from the SAT Manager, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for the Iwi (*Drepanis coccinea*) [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2016-0057; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BB54) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2793. A letter from the SAT Manager, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Sonoyta Mud Turtle [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0103; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ02) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2794. A letter from the Chief, Branch of FS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Technical Correction for Tonkin Snub-nosed Monkey [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2017-0026; 4500090024] (RIN: 1018-BC64) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2795. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's notice — Subsistence Taking of Northern Fur Seals on the Pribilof Islands; Final Annual Subsistence Harvest Levels for 2017-2019 [Docket No.: 170303228-7752-02] (RIN: 0648-BG71) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2796. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report regarding settlements and consent decrees/orders, approved by an officer of the Department of Justice (Second Quarter 2017), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2797. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revised Guidance Related to Obtaining and Reporting Taxpayer Identification Numbers and Dates of Birth by Financial Institutions [Notice 2017-46] received September 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2798. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Publications Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Treatment Under Section 956(c) of Certain Inventory Temporarily Located in the United States Following Hurricane Irma or Hurricane Maria [Notice 2017-55] received September 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2799. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Fringe Benefits Aircraft Valuation Formula (Revenue Ruling 2017-19) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2800. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Extended Due Date under Notice 2017-10 for Participants Affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, or Maria [Notice 2017-58] received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2801. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the 23rd report of the Caribbean Basin

Economic Recovery Act: Impact on U.S. Industries and Consumers and on Beneficiary Countries, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2704(a)(1); Public Law 102-182, Sec. 206(a) (as amended by Public Law 106-200, Sec. 211(d)(2)); (114 Stat. 287); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2802. A letter from the Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on Medicare payments for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, pursuant to the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014, Public Law 113-93; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2989. A bill to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission; with an amendment (Rept. 115-340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HECK, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 3963. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in manufacturing positions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Miss GONZALEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 3964. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to establish additional registration requirements for prescribers of opioids, and for other purposes; 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. RUTHERFORD (for himself and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 3965. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations for the provision of transition assistance to members of the Armed Forces recently separated from active duty service and spouses of such members; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 3966. A bill to provide that provisions of title 46, United States Code, popularly

known as the Jones Act and relating to carriage of passenger and merchandise in coastwise trade shall not apply for 5 years with respect to such carriage to and from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 3967. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize States to restrict interstate waste imports and impose a higher fee on out-of-State waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. EVANS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 3968. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide loan guarantees for the acquisition of cybersecurity technology and services by eligible small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 3969. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to include certain pension as administrative expenses in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3970. A bill to assist communities affected by stranded nuclear waste, 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 Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 3971. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify the requirements for community financial institutions with respect to certain rules relating to mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3972. A bill to clarify that family offices and family clients are accredited investors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 3973. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require certain entities to develop internal risk control mechanisms to safeguard and govern the storage of market data; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 3974. A bill to limit the use of taxpayer dollars on non-commercial flights for cabinet officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3975. A bill to require covered entities to provide notification in the case of a breach of unsecured sensitive personally identifiable information in electronic or digital form, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. COOK, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr.

BRAT, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 3976. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to allow for certain third party payments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 3977. A bill to establish the Infrastructure Bank for America to serve as a lender for infrastructure projects, both directly and through State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, 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. HILL (for himself and Mr. KIHUEN):

H.R. 3978. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. SABLON, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3979. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer services, community partnership, and refuge education programs of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PALONE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 3980. A bill to establish a United States Commission on Hate Crimes to study and make recommendations on the prevention of the commission of hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 3981. A bill to establish a cost of greenhouse gases for carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide to be used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. MESSER:

H.R. 3982. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of,

and remove the marriage penalty with respect to, social security benefits excludable from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3983. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to remove the statue to the memory and in honor of Albert Pike erected near Judiciary Square in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALONE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 3984. A bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, and provide for the discoverability and admissibility of gun trace information in civil proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TROTT (for himself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 3985. A bill to establish a working group of public and private entities led by the Food and Drug Administration to recommend voluntary frameworks and guidelines to increase the security and resilience of Internet of Medical Things devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 3986. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national standard for incorporating a passive identification ability into all firearms sold in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3987. A bill to reduce gun violence, fund gun violence research and victim assistance, and enhance the tracking of lost and stolen firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow above-the-line deductions for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 558. A resolution recognizing October 7th as National Trigeminal Neuralgia Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BOST, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 559. A resolution recognizing Navy Pier as a public community resource and treasured Chicago landmark; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WITTMAN,

Mr. KIND, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. HECK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. NOR-TON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VELA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 560. A resolution encouraging observance of National Wildlife Refuge Week with appropriate events and activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

128. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 82, strongly denouncing and opposing the violent terrorism, totalitarian impulses, xenophobic biases, and bigoted ideologies that are promoted by radical hate groups and declare these groups to be domestic terrorist organizations; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 3963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises," and to provide for the "general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 3965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 3966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2—The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make allneedful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or the other Property belonging to the United States . . ."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes).

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 3969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To Make Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 3971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, to regulate commerce

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 3973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

. . . make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 3974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 3975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 3977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 3978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 3979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 3980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 8, Clause 18: To Make All Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 3981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 3982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Equal Access to Justice for Victims of Gun Violence is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section 8

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 389: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 559: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 785: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 807: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 850: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 930: Mr. MESSER, Mr. LONG, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 936: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1318: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1405: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

- H.R. 1474: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1475: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 1552: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 1568: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1626: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1651: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1655: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1676: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1683: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HARPER, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1832: Ms. ROSEN and Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER.
H.R. 1898: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1919: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1953: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2004: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 2092: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2095: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2259: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2295: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2436: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2472: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2482: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2583: Mr. NADLER and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2687: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2690: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2712: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2740: Mr. WELCH and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2832: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 2836: Mr. SOTO, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2899: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 2926: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 2936: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 2954: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 3117: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3124: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3145: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3161: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3192: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3222: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3227: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3271: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3273: Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ESPALLAT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3380: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. ESPALLAT, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3395: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 3473: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 3497: Mr. GIBBS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3509: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3699: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3712: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. POCAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3738: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3770: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KATKO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3773: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3784: Mr. VALADAO and Ms. SHEA-POR-TER.
H.R. 3792: Mr. TONKO and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3808: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 3822: Mr. POSEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 3832: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 3845: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIRES, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3847: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3905: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3930: Mr. BARTON and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 3936: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 3947: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BERA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. COOPER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3957: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Con. Res. 56: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 128: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 142: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H. Res. 220: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. FASO.
H. Res. 257: Mr. FERGUSON.
H. Res. 283: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 313: Mr. OLSON.
H. Res. 466: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mrs. DINGELL.
H. Res. 467: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 511: Ms. NORTON and Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 555: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2017

No. 160

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Father of love, who made Heaven and Earth, sustain us through this day. May our lawmakers focus on Your glory and not their own. Inspire them with Your presence so that their lives will reflect Your mercy and truth. Lord, give them the wisdom to trust Your plans and to desire for You to do as You please for our Nation and world.

Forgive us when we depend primarily on our strength and ability to meet life's challenges, forgetting that You are able and eager to help us. God, our deliverer, we bless Your Name from this time forth and forever more. Thank You for Your merciful kindness that is new each day.

We pray in Your precious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TAX REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, during the Obama years, many of the hard-working men and women of America's middle class felt completely forgotten. Paychecks often did not keep pace with rising costs. Opportunities

for work could often seem bleak. For those men and women, the promise of a hard-earned retirement seemed to drift further and further away. For so many middle-class Americans, the last decade meant a weak economy and a decline of opportunities. People of this Nation deserve better. They deserve larger paychecks, more jobs, and better opportunities to get ahead.

This Congress is committed to helping the economy live up to its full potential once again, which is exactly why we are committed to passing tax reform. This is our once-in-a-generation opportunity to overhaul a broken tax code that holds us back and replace it with something that actually works for the hard-working people of our country. It represents the single most important thing we can do today to get our economy back on the right track.

Working together, President Trump, his team, and the tax-writing committees in Congress have developed the framework that will help us get there. Here is what it envisions:

For American workers, we want to make your taxes lower, simpler, and fairer. We want to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more in yours.

Helping individuals and families succeed is the first aim of tax reform. Helping businesses succeed is the second aim, so we can help create more jobs and keep them right here in America.

American businesses, both large and small, face an increasingly competitive global economy. We want to put American businesses and workers on a level playing field because when they are, they can win.

We want to help bring jobs and profits back home, and once they are here, we want to give businesses the right incentives to keep them right here in America.

We want to unleash the potential of the American economy—helping you keep more of the money in your pay-

check, helping businesses grow and workers succeed, helping move the economy into high gear so we can sustain real prosperity into the future for America's middle class.

These are the kinds of ideas that should be shared by everyone, Republicans and Democrats alike. Our friends across the aisle supported the need for tax reform for many years. They used to advocate it loudly. But the tone seems to be different now. What changed? The President, or so it would seem.

We know that our Democratic friends are under immense pressure from the hard left to oppose everything this President touches, but I hope they can resist that pressure and do what they know is right. After all, shouldn't we all support cutting middle-class taxes, helping small businesses, and bringing jobs and investments back to our country?

I was always under the impression that Democrats wanted to end corporate offshoring, eliminate loopholes for the wealthy, and cut middle-class taxes. Well, these are all aspects of the current tax reform framework. So there is no need for our friends to invent reasons to justify opposing tax reform. There is no reason to launch attacks on the tax reform framework based on made-up details that aren't actually in it. Tax reform has been a bipartisan effort in the past. It can be, and it should be, again now.

It is up to our Democratic friends to decide if they would like to engage in a serious way. I personally hope they will join us in advancing this important initiative for our country. I think we owe at least that much to the millions of Americans who felt forgotten over the last decade.

Tax reform can help move our economy into high gear. It can help deliver more jobs, higher wages, and increased opportunities for the American people. The men and women of this country deserve it, which is why I am committed

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6327

to keeping up the work to get tax reform accomplished.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Quarles nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to applaud the nomination of Randal Quarles to help oversee the Federal Reserve System. Mr. Quarles is certainly eminently qualified to serve in this capacity in this important position. Through his long experience in public service and the private sector, Mr. Quarles has gained experience in financial regulation, economics, and the firsthand operations of financial institutions. He also has a proven track record of leadership and policy management.

The Fed's responsibilities are extensive, and they are varied, and the roles Mr. Quarles has been nominated for come during a unique period in the Fed's history. The years ahead will be decisive for the development of the Federal Reserve, the American economy, as well as domestic and international financial reform. It is paramount that the Fed be equipped with a well-rounded leadership team so it can meet the many challenges and opportunities of maintaining monetary and financial stability. I firmly believe that Mr. Quarles is an ideal fit to take on such responsibilities—for the success of the Federal Reserve and the good of our Nation.

In closing, I applaud and strongly support the President's nominee to help oversee the Federal Reserve System. I know him personally. I know what a fine man he is. I know what an excellent leader he is. He will do a good job.

Importantly, I would note that it is the intention to confirm Mr. Quarles to

the position of Vice Chair for Supervision—another essential role.

It is critical that Mr. Quarles begin his work at the Fed as soon as possible. There really is no time to waste. He will do a great job.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I had expected to be able to vote today on the confirmation of Mr. Randal Quarles to be a member of the Federal Reserve. Instead, I am in Las Vegas, meeting with victims of and first responders to the deadliest mass shooting in modern U.S. history.

On the question of Mr. Quarles's nomination, I want to make clear that I would have voted "no" had I been present. While an official in the Bush administration Treasury Department in the lead-up to the economic crisis of 2007 to 2009, Mr. Quarles failed to take action to prevent the build-up of risk that ultimately led to hundreds of thousands of foreclosures and evictions in Nevada. In fact, Mr. Quarles during that period repeatedly maintained that the financial system was safe, that large banks were well-capitalized, and that the housing market was strong, notwithstanding clear signs of escalating risk. After serving in the Treasury Department, Mr. Quarles was the beneficiary of the second-largest "loss share" agreement in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's history. This agreement provided a taxpayer-backed guarantee and allowed Mr. Quarles to profit substantially off of the failure of a large bank.

If confirmed, I hope that Mr. Quarles will exceed my expectations and become a strong advocate for a safe and resilient American financial system. However, I cannot in good conscience vote to confirm him given my concerns about his past record.

Thank you.

NOMINATION OF LEE FRANCIS CISSNA

Mr. President, I had expected to be able to vote today on the confirmation of Mr. Lee Francis Cissna, to be Director of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS. Instead, I am in Las Vegas helping my constituents in the aftermath of the worst mass shooting in modern American history.

On the question of Mr. Cissna's nomination, I want to make my opposition to his confirmation clear. I do not believe Mr. Cissna to be qualified to lead the USCIS. This decision is based on his prior experience, as well as his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Mr. Cissna stated during his confirmation hearing that he had a role on President Trump's transition team and he offered his "technical assistance" in crafting some of the President's draconian immigration policies. Additionally, it is my belief that Mr. Cissna does not have the management experience necessary to oversee a large organization like the USCIS.

If confirmed, I hope that Mr. Cissna will surpass my expectations and serve

this country well as USCIS Director. The role of the USCIS in implementing and administering our immigration benefits is too important for any other result. I believe strongly in the importance of immigrants to the culture and economy of the United States, and I hope Mr. Cissna's actions as Director show that he agrees. However, I cannot in good conscience vote to confirm someone about whom I have so many concerns.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as we continue to grieve with the people of Las Vegas and families of the injured and the deceased, when I think of the pictures I see of those beautiful young people who had the best of life ahead of them, we ache for them. But our thoughts must turn to action so this doesn't happen again.

What can we do as a nation to change? Because surely when there are more mass shootings this year than there are the number of days this year, when we average more than one mass shooting per day, something has to change.

I am sure that if you asked the grieving families whether they want the laws to change so this might not happen again, the overwhelming majority would say yes, they would want us to do something. If we could talk to those brave souls who were killed and are now in Heaven, they would say: Do something. They wouldn't say: Let's wait. They wouldn't say: Leave things alone. The fact that they were killed, the fact that there were so many injured—they wouldn't think it is political to try to save their lives or prevent somebody else from dying the way they did. So when folks say: Don't bring politics into this, that it is inappropriate, I am sure the families of the loved ones who were lost would agree with me that it is appropriate and important and necessary.

Politics is where we are supposed to come together and debate the great problems of our time in order to find solutions to them. Politics is how we are supposed to make our country a better, safer, more prosperous place to live. And there is no more appropriate time than now to talk about the issue of gun violence.

Yesterday, President Trump visited Las Vegas. I am glad he went to show our solidarity and remind everyone there that they have the full support of the Nation. But he didn't talk about guns. There is a huge opportunity he

missed to lead this Nation in a reasonable, moderate debate on gun safety, but that opportunity is not over. The President still has the opportunity. All eyes are on the President to see if he will grasp the opportunity and lead the Nation to do something reasonable and moderate about guns and gun safety.

President Trump, are you going to wait to hear what the NRA says first? Are you going to wait for the NRA to give you the green light? You ran your campaign saying you were beholden to no one. You fashion yourself as a strong man. Well, are you going to show that you are not beholden to anyone now? Are you going to show your strength now? Are you going to be the first Republican President in a generation to buck the NRA? You know what the right thing to do is.

I say to President Trump: Come out and say that you support and would sign a law to ban bump stocks—the modification used by the Las Vegas gunman to make his weapons automatic. That is small, and it is the right thing to do. Don't wait for the NRA to make up their mind. Do it.

Of course, banning bump stocks can't be our only response. It is hardly enough. Even though we should do whatever we can in this body in obedience to the NRA, we must do more. Abandoning efforts to deregulate silencers would be the next step. The police were able to figure out where the gunman was because of the noise from his gun in the Mandalay Bay Hotel.

Let's forget about implementing a national concealed carry reciprocity. My police officers in Times Square don't want to let someone who has had no check, who might have a mental derangement like Paddock, come to Times Square—and they can't do anything about it; that is what that law would do—or any other heavily populated place, the downtowns of many of our big cities and even medium-sized cities, Disney World, baseball games, football stadiums. If this concealed carry reciprocity passed, crazy people could carry weapons concealed into any football stadium in America, and the police couldn't check on them and see if they had a gun.

We have to do these things. If you looked at what would be the most effective way in stopping the daily gun violence that is doable, the most important and attainable thing to do would be adopting universal background checks. It is common sense, it is measured, it is prudent, and it would be really effective.

The bill Senator MURPHY introduced yesterday is one I have been involved with for a long time, and we should see if we can get enough support to pass it. We can and should talk about these issues more. It requires only a modicum of moral and political courage. President Trump and Republicans in Congress ought to show that moral and political courage now by bucking the NRA and engaging in a reasonable debate about commonsense gun laws.

Fully automatic weapons are already illegal, made so by a law signed by President Reagan in 1986. Banning bump stocks is entirely consistent with the books. Senator FEINSTEIN introduced a reasonable proposal. What are we waiting for, the NRA to give us a green light? That is so wrong.

If the President and Congress are so beholden to the NRA that they can't do the very bare minimum—banning a device that allowed a shooter to kill 59 Americans with ease, a device whose ban would in no way infringe on the legitimate rights of gun owners—then our politics, our means of making this country a better and safer place, will have once again failed us.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS
RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. President, turning to the humanitarian crisis in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, yesterday, once again, Congress received a request from the administration for a supplemental aid package that will go to help Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and other States hit by storms. It also includes some money for the Western States beset by wildfires.

It is a good first step, but it is just the start of a long recovery and relief effort that will require additional aid from this Congress. While aid and resources are necessary now, these islands are just starting to assess the damage. Once they determine how devastating these storms actually were, we need to respond immediately to provide additional support and funds to assist their recovery and rebuilding, just as we have done for past storms and disasters. On this package, I have three points.

First, I am urging my colleagues to add additional and vital flexible funding for recovery like the community development block grant. We gave CDBG to help Texas after Harvey. We can't deprive Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands of this money.

Second, I am warning my colleagues on the other side—particularly those in the House—not to attach any extraneous, ideological policy riders to this urgent aid package. Ideological policy changes to the Flood Insurance Program and forest management policies should come nowhere near this bill. They tried to do it last week in the FAA bill, and we had to send it back because of joint opposition, both sides of the aisle. Let's not go through that again. I thank our chairman of the Banking Committee for helping in that regard.

Third, it has become clear that Puerto Rico's recovery will be further hindered by its ongoing debt crisis. That crisis, coupled with the devastation from Hurricane Maria, has led to growing concerns that the island will soon face a liquidity crisis. Simply put, the island is running out of money to pay for essential services like first responders, not to mention funds for rebuilding and recovery. The funds we hope to include in the disaster package are crit-

ical, but we have to make sure the island has enough cash to start the process. In FEMA, local governments often have to lay out the money first and then they get repaid, but Puerto Rico doesn't have the money to lay out so we have to deal with that issue to make it effective.

With these issues in mind, we should act quickly on this supplemental aid, but it is just the beginning of Congress's aid to rebuild.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, finally, on the Republican tax plan, I have so much to say about this plan. It is so awful in so many ways: huge tax cuts for the wealthy and the powerful, raising taxes on middle-class people—which I am going to talk about in a minute—blowing a huge hole in our deficit, and to fund the tax cuts for the rich, cutting Medicare and Medicaid by close to \$1.5 trillion.

We are all in favor of a serious tax reform debate. We have mentioned our guidelines: no tax cuts for the 1 percent, no increase in the deficit, and do it in a bipartisan way. The Republican plan does just the opposite. That is why Democrats are so opposed. It lavishes tax breaks on the rich, pays for it by cutting Medicare and Medicaid, and leaves everyone in the cold, except the very wealthy.

Today I want to focus on one provision of the GOP tax plan: the repeal of the State and local tax deduction. The Republican plan raises taxes on millions of middle-class families across the country by repealing the State and local deduction. Forty-four million Americans take that deduction. That is about one in eight. It is about one in four or five families who take that deduction. One-third of all taxpayers take the deduction. It is almost one in three. They don't just get a few pennies back. They get several thousand dollars off their taxes each year. It is not just a rarified group in States like Massachusetts, New York, and California. The reason it brings in \$1.3 trillion is because it affects so many people throughout the entire country.

If you do not believe me, look at the numbers. Look at these charts. I am posting the percentages for each State. Forty-six percent of the people in Maryland get an average deduction of \$12,900. Connecticut gets 41 percent. I showed one of my colleagues that Virginia is higher than New York. Thirty-seven percent get an \$11,000 deduction. Massachusetts, Oregon. To my colleagues from Utah, 35 percent of Utah taxpayers get an average deduction of \$12,954. In Utah, they say: Well, the standard deduction makes up for it. With most families, the standard deduction will not because we are taking away the standard exemption so it is a wash if you are a family of three.

Let's keep going. Minnesota and New York. I want to show my Republican colleagues how it would affect some of their States. Let's take Georgia. One-third of all taxpayers get an average

break of \$9,000. Look at these numbers, my colleagues. I am going to send them to every one of you. Look how it affects your State.

Here we go. Iowa, 29 percent of all people get a \$10,000 break, on average; Pennsylvania, 29 percent, an \$11,000 break; Arizona, 28 percent, a \$7,000 break.

My friend from Idaho, I didn't know he would be here, but his number on the chart—28 percent of Idahoans get an average of an \$8,800 break. Do you want to take that away from them? The standard deduction doesn't make up for it if you have one child or more. Nebraska, 28 percent get an \$11,000 deduction.

By the way, these numbers come from a group that put it together, but it is from the IRS. These are IRS numbers.

South Carolina, 27 percent, \$8,000; Missouri, 26 percent, \$9,800; Ohio, 26 percent, \$10,000. Kentucky, my dear friend the Republican leader, in his State, 26 percent of the people—one out of four—get that State and local property deduction, averaging \$9,995. Do you want to take that away?

Alabama, where our dear friend the Presiding Officer is from, gets 26 percent. One out of four of his constituents get an average break of \$5,900. Kansas, 25 percent, gets an average break of \$9,400.

I am saying these numbers because our friends on the hard right, who just want to lower their own taxes, are telling everybody, oh, this is just in four States—Massachusetts, New York, California, New Jersey.

No, it is across America.

Let's keep going. I am having a good time. I hope you all are.

Oklahoma, 24 percent of the people get an \$8,000 break. I think this is Mississippi, 23 percent, gets a \$6,300 break; Louisiana, 23 percent, close to one out of four, \$6,700. Texas, the great State of Texas, where our majority whip comes from, 23 percent, close to one out of four Texans, get a \$7,800 break. Indiana, 23 percent get an \$8,700 break; Florida, 22 percent get a \$7,300 break. Wyoming—it wouldn't affect Wyoming because it is a rural State—22 percent get a \$6,300 break.

The State that is least affected is still very affected. South Dakota and West Virginia, only 17 percent of the people get a \$9,000 break in West Virginia and a \$6,000 break in South Dakota. North Dakota, Tennessee, and Arkansas—21 percent, 19 percent, 18 percent breaks, between \$4,900 and \$6,800.

The Achilles' heel of this bill—there are many—is State and local deductibility. It kills the middle class and the upper middle income people. It doesn't really affect the rich. They do not pay a lot of property taxes, the bulk of these deductions. They make their money in high-income places. They have a lot of stocks and a lot of bonds. It is the middle class and the upper middle class who get clobbered by this

tax break. The standard deduction does not undo it because you lose the standard exemption. Even if you are just a husband and wife without kids—

Mr. President, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the debate be delayed for a few minutes. I know my colleagues are—well, I just need to finish my remarks. I am almost done.

The benefit of State and local deductibility affects every State, every city, every town, every municipality, and goes deep into the middle class and the working class.

One other point I have to make, now realizing this, some of our Republican colleagues are saying we will modify it. Folks, there is no real way to modify the provision to eliminate State and local deductibility. If you want to give a choice that will not work—because for middle-class taxpayers, it is only the combination of their itemized deductions, such as State, local, mortgage, and others, that make it worth it for them to itemize.

If you have to choose between the mortgage deduction and your property tax deduction, it is a loser. So they say: Well, we will just do this for the very rich. Yet, as I mentioned, that is not where the money is. Where are you going to cap it? It is mostly a middle-class deduction. If you cap it, say, for people whose incomes are above \$500,000 or \$1 million, you don't bring in much money. So it is a loser. You cannot fix it. Get rid of it. You cannot fix it. The plans that are being done still continue to hurt the middle class dramatically.

The Republican plan to repeal State and local cannot be fixed, modified, or tweaked around the edges. Each of the proposals does not work. It must be scrapped. The State and local deduction affects everyone, even the almost one in five taxpayers in the lowest States where it affects the fewest people. It is just one of the many flaws in this broken, broken framework.

Let's start over. Don't just do a Republican plan that appeals to the handful of very wealthy corporations and very wealthy individuals. Work with us on a fair plan that helps the middle class, not the very wealthy. We are ready, but if you do the same thing that you did on healthcare in trying to do it by yourselves, I think that you will meet with the same fate that the healthcare bill did.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CRAPO and I both be allowed to speak for 5 minutes on the nomination of Randal Quarles.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, every time President Trump has the choice between standing up for American families or standing up for wealthy banks and giant corporations, he chooses the rich guys.

Time and again, he has promised that he would "never be beholden to the lobbyists or the special interests," but he has appointed dozens of Big Business executives and lobbyists to senior positions in his administration. During his campaign, he promised that he would not let the Wall Street guys get away with murder, but after he was sworn in, he loaded up his economic team with Goldman Sachs executives. Over and over again, he has promised to drain the swamp, but then he appointed an army of lobbyists and industry insiders to positions that oversee the industries that paid them for years.

Randal Quarles is just the latest in this long line of corporate appointments. He is President Trump's nominee to the Federal Reserve's Vice Chair for Supervision. He has gone through the revolving door so many times that it is hard to keep up—from a big Wall Street law firm, to the Treasury Department, back to the Wall Street law firm, back, eventually, to the Treasury Department, then to a private equity fund, followed most recently by a trip to another private equity fund. Now Mr. Quarles is ready for another spin through the revolving door.

The Vice Chair for Supervision of the Fed is one of the most important jobs in the government. After the 2008 crisis, Congress put the Fed in charge of supervising the biggest banks. That included banks and other financial institutions that would bring down the whole financial system with them if they went under—the so-called "too big to fail" institutions. The Fed is what stands between millions of American families and another economic catastrophe that could rob them of their jobs, their savings, or their homes. After the 2008 crisis, Congress created the Vice Chair for Supervision position to lead efforts to supervise these giant institutions. There is no other position in government that has a more important role in stopping the next financial crisis.

So what kind of supervision and oversight does Mr. Quarles believe in? His motto seems to be, "Whatever the big banks want, give it to 'em."

Mr. Quarles has spent more than a decade in private equity and investment management, where he has argued repeatedly for weaker rules for giant banks, including relaxing the rules for stress tests that evaluate banks' soundness, lowering capital and leverage standards, and repealing the Volcker rule.

At his hearing before the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, I showed Mr. Quarles a 124-page list of financial rule rollbacks from a lobbying group for the biggest banks in the country. I asked him to tell me which of those dozens of changes he disagreed with. He couldn't name one—not one.

The No. 1 thing that we need from a Vice Chair for Supervision is independence from Wall Street—a demonstrated willingness to stand up to the wishes of

the big banks and protect the interests of working families. There is not a speck of independence in Mr. Quarles' track record.

Mr. Quarles' time in government also raises red flags. As Under Secretary of the Treasury for Domestic Finance, he was responsible for overseeing financial institutions, markets, and regulations in the years leading up to the financial crisis. Let me say that again. Mr. Quarles was the Treasury official in charge of helping to oversee Wall Street in the years leading up to the crisis. Does anyone want to point out how that worked out?

If Mr. Quarles had wanted to stand up to the banks, he could have found and fixed systemwide problems in the markets before catastrophe struck. Instead, in 2006, when the banks were making gobs of money off of risky bets that eventually crashed the economy, Quarles gave a speech in front of a roomful of bankers and said: "Fundamentally, the economy is strong, the financial sector is healthy, and our future"—the banks—"looks bright." Less than 2 years later, the entire system exploded and cost Americans, collectively, about \$14 trillion.

Make no mistake about it, confirming Mr. Quarles endangers the health of the economy. The last time that Mr. Quarles was in charge, he failed to act to protect the American people from the biggest recession since the Great Depression either because he missed the signs or because he deliberately ignored them. Either way, that makes him the wrong person for the job.

American families deserve a strong leader as the Vice Chair for Supervision of the Fed who will fight hard to keep them safe. Everything we know about Mr. Quarles says that he will be fighting hard for the big banks. I will be voting no on Mr. Quarles' nomination, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of the Honorable Randal Quarles to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. Quarles has extensive government and private-sector experience dealing with both domestic and international financial markets. He is no stranger to public service in his having previously served in multiple top posts in the Treasury Department.

Mr. Quarles has also been nominated to serve as the Vice Chairman for Supervision, a role that has never been officially filled. Instead, former Federal Governor Dan Tarullo has acted as the de facto Vice Chairman for Supervision in various ways, including by chairing the Federal Reserve Board's Committee on Supervision and Regulation, overseeing the Large Institution Supervision Coordinating Committee, and representing the Fed at the Financial Stability Board and in Basel, among other functions.

In February, Chair Yellen committed in a hearing that she expected President Trump's nominee for Vice Chairman for Supervision to have the same responsibilities that Governor Tarullo had, including heading the Federal Reserve's Committee on Supervision and Regulation and representing the Fed at the Financial Stability Board and in Basel.

I expect Mr. Quarles to perform those same duties in the interim, and I look forward to confirming him to that position soon. Mr. Quarles has strong bipartisan support and was voted out of the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee with the affirmative vote of 17 to 6. If confirmed, he will play a key role in developing regulatory and supervisory policy for the Federal Reserve System.

I urge all of my colleagues to support Mr. Quarles' nomination today and vote for his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Quarles nomination?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 213 Ex.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Rubio
Cardin	Inhofe	Sasse
Carper	Isakson	Scott
Cassidy	Johnson	Shaheen
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Coons	King	Strange
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McCain	Tillis
Cruz	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Moran	Warner
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Nelson	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—32

Baldwin	Franken	Markey
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Menendez
Booker	Harris	Merkley
Brown	Hassan	Murphy
Cantwell	Heinrich	Murray
Casey	Hirono	Reed
Duckworth	Kaine	Sanders
Durbin	Klobuchar	Schatz
Feinstein	Leahy	

Schumer	Udall	Whitehouse
Stabenow	Warren	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Cortez Masto	Heller
---------	--------------	--------

The nomination was confirmed. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Idaho. Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise to make a unanimous consent request. We have been able to work out an agreement on further aspects of Mr. Quarles' nomination.

I want to thank my ranking member, SHERROD BROWN, for working with us on this and helping us to be able to move forward.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 303.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the Senate then resume consideration of the Gingrich nomination.

One modification, Mr. President. I am striking the portion of this unanimous consent request relating to the Gingrich nomination.

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

Is there further debate on the nomination?

Hearing none, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Quarles nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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 nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to

be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John McCain, Pat Roberts, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Lee, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, James M. Inhofe, Cory Gardner, Jeff Flake, John Thune, John Barrasso, Orrin G. Hatch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 214 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Strange
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Daines	Manchin	Thune
Donnelly	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McCaskill	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Cortez Masto	Heller
---------	--------------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 43. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be

Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Cissna nomination?

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Strange
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Daines	Manchin	Thune
Donnelly	McCain	Tillis
Enzi	McCaskill	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Cortez Masto	Heller
---------	--------------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, not too long ago—I believe this was 2011—a President came to a joint session of Congress and before the American people, he said what needed to be said about our Tax Code. He was pretty blunt. He said that our Tax Code is “rigged.” He said: “It makes no sense, and it has to change.” Of course, you can imagine, that was met with bipartisan applause in the House Chamber and across the country.

The same President called on Democrats and Republicans to “simplify the system, get rid of the loopholes, and . . . lower the corporate tax rate”—one that, I might add, ranks among the highest in the industrialized world.

That President, like the rest of us, knows that our business tax rate is a self-inflicted economic wound because businesses figure out, How can I move money offshore and my headquarters offshore, and if I earn money overseas, how can I avoid bringing that back to the United States for better wages and more jobs and to build the business? That is all because of our self-destructive Tax Code.

But the President's name—and I gave it away by saying the year the speech was given. The President's name might surprise you, given the nature of the current debate in Washington. It was Barack Obama who said that, and the straight talk came from his 2011 State of the Union address.

Let's fast forward a few years. We have a new President from a different party beating the same drum. President Trump has called our Tax Code a relic and a colossal barrier standing in the way of America's economic comeback. He is right, of course, but so was President Obama.

Tax reform doesn't have to be partisan. In fact, it shouldn't be because the ramifications are much more important than just the politics and the scorekeeping of the day. The job creators in my State of Texas are the ones who really understand what is at stake because they are living it. They are the ones who are getting slammed by our current system.

Take Lisa Fullerton, for example, who owns a small retail business in San Antonio, my hometown. Ms. Fullerton is an accountant with 33 years of experience, who used to handle her own business's tax compliance in-house. Eventually, though, the code became too complex, and enforcement became too punitive, and she couldn't take that risk anymore. She said that her outsourcing of tax and employment functions now costs her small business roughly \$280,000 more per year than it did in 2000.

Lisa is far from the only one who is frustrated. Kurt Summers is the President of Austin Generator Service, a small residential power company in the Texas capital. For him, a lower tax rate would mean the difference between his company turning a profit or

a loss. It would literally make the difference between being able to keep the doors open or have to lock them up permanently. He explained that any extra profits realized through tax savings might enable his company to grow more aggressively. To him, the need for change is very simple. It means more hiring and more jobs.

So Texans, like Alaskans and like all Americans, get the picture. But the picture is pretty messed up, and it doesn't make any sense.

Greg Brown, President of W.W. Cannon, an industrialized storage company in Dallas, says that compliance has gotten to be a truly herculean tax. It has gotten so difficult that he has had to outsource that to a CPA—again, because it is so complex and people don't want to risk the burden of not doing it right because of the punitive nature of the penalties.

Darryl Lyons, CEO of PAX Financial Group, has done the same thing. He is harmed each year by the passthrough taxes on his small business income, which impair his ability to save for business emergencies, as well as to pay off his company debt.

Lastly, in terms of my stories here, Andy Ellard, the owner and general manager of a machine company in Dallas, regularly purchases expensive computer numerical controlled equipment to stay competitive in his industry. I have no idea what that is—computer numerical controlled equipment. He said that the tax ramifications of every purchase have to be considered. Almost every day, he asks: Can we expense it? Do we have to depreciate it? And if we do, over how long?

Mr. Ellard isn't shy with his words. He calls the complicated deduction scheme for business expenses "chaos."

Clearly, something needs to change. As I said at the outset, that has been acknowledged on a bipartisan basis by the current President and the past President. I even brought out some quotes yesterday or the day before from the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, making exactly the same argument. The ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Oregon, said that lowering the corporate tax rate will make America more competitive globally and will bring money back home for jobs and investment in our country. So it is important for us to be consistent and, unfortunately, they haven't been.

Things are starting to change. Last week, the so-called Big 6—led by Speaker RYAN; Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin; KEVIN BRADY, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; and the Finance Committee chairman, ORRIN HATCH—released a unified framework that contains core principles for reform. Among them are a simplified rate structure, the elimination of the alternative minimum tax, and many itemized deductions and incentives for companies to keep jobs on American soil. Perhaps most importantly, the framework rec-

ommends what is widely agreed upon as overdue, which is lowering our uncompetitive corporate rate, which puts American employers and workers at a disadvantage.

Today, it is sad but true that we are divided on many issues in America. But as President Trump and President Obama have suggested, tax reform does not have to be one of them.

I listened to our friend the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, this morning, calling for bipartisan tax reform. They are going to have a chance to do that because, after we pass a budget resolution, I anticipate that in the Senate Finance Committee, Senator HATCH will call up a base bill known as the chairman's mark, which will be open for amendment in the Senate Finance Committee. That is what people have been asking for, a chance to participate in the writing of the legislation in the committee and then to have it come to the floor for open debate and amendment. It is what we call regular order around here. But what I am hearing from our Democratic colleagues is, yes, they want bipartisan legislation, but they don't want to participate in the process of writing. It strikes me as pretty hypocritical. This shouldn't be partisan, as President Obama and President Trump have demonstrated and as Democrats and Republicans alike have said time and again.

We in Washington have no magic wand that will make our Tax Code suddenly disappear, but that doesn't excuse us from working to make taxes and tax compliance a little less painful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, last weekend a man camped out on the 32nd floor of the Mandalay Bay Hotel in Las Vegas. He stockpiled 23 weapons and hundreds of rounds of ammunition. He set up bipods and scopes. He brought a hammer to knock out the window. Then, on Sunday, he opened fire. He kept firing for 15 minutes, stopping only to reload and switch weapons. Over 15 minutes, he murdered 58 Americans and injured more than 500.

The day after the shooting, I was in Washington. I had seven or eight meetings, and not a single person in those meetings brought up the worst shooting in modern American history—not one.

I am not sure if it was two mass shootings ago or three when we started to accept this as a normal condition of American life, when we lost our belief that it was within our power to protect our fellow Americans at a country music concert or at a nightclub or at a movie theater or at a school.

I know there are strong beliefs about guns in America—principled beliefs—but there are also steps that the overwhelming majority of Americans want us to take. There are 90 percent of

Americans who think we need background checks for every gun sale, including 74 percent of NRA members. There are 89 percent of Americans who think we should prevent the mentally ill from purchasing guns. There are 82 percent of Republicans who want us to bar gun purchases for people on the no-fly or terrorist watch list. Yet Congress has done nothing to respond to the American people. We did nothing after Aurora, after Newtown, after Orlando—nothing.

Unlike Washington, in Colorado, after the two mass shootings in Aurora and at Columbine, our legislators rose to the occasion and made tough choices after we suffered two of the worst mass shootings in our Nation's history. After the massacre at Columbine, we closed the gun show loophole. After the tragedy in Aurora, we strengthened our background checks in a Western State. Last year, those background checks blocked 8,704 people from buying guns. That may sound like a lot, but 380,000 people applied for guns in Colorado last year. That means just 2 percent of those folks who applied were blocked and that 98 percent were able to buy guns without a problem.

Who were the 2 percent whom Colorado is blocking but whom this Congress fails to block? Among them were murderers and rapists and kidnapers and domestic abusers.

No one could come to this floor and tell me Colorado is worse off because we have kept guns out of the hands of those people. The average wait time for those background checks is 12 minutes. That strikes me as a fair tradeoff to keep guns out of the hands of murderers and kidnapers and rapists. Yet here in Washington, despite now an annual tragedy—tragedy after tragedy—Congress has done nothing. We haven't even done the simple things like close the gun show loophole or stop people on the terrorist watch list from buying weapons.

This is not about taking guns away from people who have them. It is about keeping guns out of the hands of people who nearly everybody agrees should not have them. It is about stopping more people like the Las Vegas killer from modifying his rifles to become almost fully automatic and far more deadly. I cosponsored a bill this week to ban those modifications, and I am encouraged that some of my Republican colleagues seem to be open to that idea.

I know we cannot stop every madman or every random act of violence in this country—we cannot—just as we cannot stop every murder from happening, but that does not mean we should not make them less likely or that we cannot take steps to limit their harm, steps that are backed by the overwhelming majority of Americans and that are fully consistent with the Constitution.

I remember, after the shooting at the Pulse Nightclub, I was supposed to take my daughter to camp that day.

She was going to be away from us for a month. I can remember I did everything I could to keep her from hearing the news that day, as the numbers of fatalities increased during the course of the day, because I didn't want her to leave us—she was about 12 at the time—with a sense of fear, the fear I felt and the country felt. I am so sorry my children and America's children have to grow up in a country where mass shootings are common, where we are beginning to see them just as part of our lives.

I heard somebody the other day on television say that is the price of freedom. What a shame that somebody would say that in the United States of America. What a surrender that represents to our children and to the victims of these crimes. I didn't grow up in that America, but conditions have changed. We have let it happen. The result is, we now have an entire generation of Americans—of our countrymen, our sons, and our daughters—who are growing up with a reasonable fear that they could be victims of a mass shooting or that their moms or their dads might not come home one day.

I think our kids have enough to worry about. They have every right to see a movie with their parents, to go dancing with their friends, or to see a concert on their one night off without having the fear of being shot down by people who have no business carrying such powerful weapons. They have a right to expect that this Congress will finally do something about gun violence in our country—violence which is far greater than anywhere else in the industrialized world.

In the wake of these horrific acts, as always, Americans spring into action. First responders secure the area and care for the wounded. Neighbors hold vigils to honor the victims and support grieving families. Journalists shed light on what happened and why. Citizens speak out to demand action from their elected officials. They are doing their jobs, and it is time for Congress to do ours.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from West Virginia.

TAX REFORM

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, last week, I rose to talk about the importance of tax reform. I believe this is a policy issue we cannot talk about enough and that we cannot emphasize enough. So, today, I rise to talk about how important the reform is to our small businesses, and in the coming weeks, I will be up here to talk about other important aspects of tax reform.

We are all from different States and other parts of the country, but we all know small businesses are a major economic driver in our country, as 95 percent of businesses in the United States are small businesses, and that number is even higher in my State of West Virginia. Small businesses employ more than half of West Virginia's workforce.

Yet our small businesses face a marginal tax rate as high as 39.6 percent. At the same time, their effective tax rate can vary widely. In fact, a CNBC survey showed that 22 percent of small businesses cannot really say what their effective tax rate really is.

Think about that.

If you are a small business that is a partnership or an LLC, then your profits are going to pass through to you and be taxed at the individual rate. There are currently seven individual tax brackets. Then you have credits and deductions. There is also a self-employment tax, and the list goes on. On top of that, small businesses can have Social Security and Medicare taxes, a Federal unemployment tax, and employment taxes. That is not even taking into account taxes like a State-level income tax or property tax and more. That is why businesses and individuals spend billions of dollars a year to comply with the Tax Code. That is more than 18 hours for every man and woman and child in the United States of America. If I could give a visual here, that is basically 3 million people working full time on taxes for small businesses at a cost of \$195 billion.

The point is, it is complicated. Our Tax Code is too complicated, and that is part of what tax reform is about—simplifying the Tax Code. If Congress can simplify the Tax Code just to cut compliance costs in half, think of how many significant resources that would free up that would be better used to grow the economy, create jobs, raise wages, and expand businesses.

The National Federation of Independent Business, which represents 325,000 small businesses across this country, called this tax reform framework a good start, and it has urged us to take swift action. According to a survey by Paychex, 41 percent of small business owners want tax reform to be the very top priority.

Whom will these reforms really help? We are going to have a long discussion on this. This is just part of whom they will help. They will help the small businesses that employ so many people in my home State of West Virginia. They will help people like Eric Hott, of EH Chocolates & More, from Hampshire County. Eric has a great story. Eric grew up on a farm in Kirby, WV. His mother was from Hornberg, Germany. While growing up, his grandmother was always cooking something. After graduating from high school, Eric moved to Germany to begin a culinary apprenticeship. By 2006, he had a chef apprenticeship at a five-star hotel in Germany. He went on to serve at events like the G8 Summit and for guests that included the German Chancellor and his First Lady. After running a patisserie in Germany, he moved to Switzerland, where he refined and perfected the art of chocolate-making. That sounds good to me. Then what did he do? He wanted to come home. He returned home to West Virginia. He went back to Kirby, WV, and started his own

small businesses—first EH Chocolates & More and, later, Farm Fresh Produce. Both are growing and delicious businesses.

Small businesses employ middle-class Americans who power this and other small businesses across the country. We need more folks like Eric—lots more—who are willing to take the risk, who have a good idea, and who want to stay and work in their own homes in rural America and certainly in our State of West Virginia, which has had a major economic downturn. We need more Eric Hotts. We need to simplify the Tax Code for small businesses and let them focus on what they do best, which is refining their products, providing their services, and providing jobs for people in their various areas.

As much as any other policy that Congress can advance, tax reform will promote growth and provide job opportunities across this great country. Across the entire country, only two in five distressed communities have seen any job growth during the past 5 years. Fully 50 percent of U.S. job growth has occurred in just 2 percent of our country's counties.

We need to change that. We need to help small businesses that are major economic drivers in every part of our country. It is no wonder that small businesses have found it difficult to open, let alone succeed in many parts of our country. Because of our outdated Tax Code, real wages for most workers have barely increased for decades. By modernizing our Tax Code, we can create more opportunity and higher wages for Americans. We can achieve a simpler system with lower rates that is good for business and workers and, from the description I just put forward, would be a good time saver and resource saver.

The best thing about this in terms of small business is that it would lead to more jobs. Let's create an environment that leads to more investment in our States and continues to grow and build jobs. These are the changes hardworking West Virginians and Americans are hungering for. In order to make West Virginia the best place to live and work, now is the time for tax reform.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to make this a reality. Doing it will benefit so many—everyone in this country.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1937 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

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

REMEMBERING ELDER ROBERT D. HALES

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I rise today to honor the life of Elder Robert D. Hales, a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Elder Hales passed away peacefully on Sunday, October 1, at the age of 85. He leaves behind his faithful wife Mary and their two sons, Stephen and David.

Robert Hales was born and raised in a faithful household in Long Island, NY. He was an all-American boy who played baseball through college at the University of Utah but eventually traded in his baseball uniform for a flight suit, serving in the U.S. Air Force as a jet fighter pilot. Elder Hales's service as a military aviator would inform the rest of his life and certainly his entire ministry. He took with him the unit motto displayed on the side of his aircraft: "Return With Honor."

After his discharge from the military, Elder Hales entered the world of international business. In jobs around the world, he established a reputation as an enthusiastic leader who relished a challenge and dealt fairly with others. Because of these qualities, Elder Hales rose to become president of Paper Mate, a division of Gillette. Later, he assumed senior executive positions at Max Factor Company, the Hughes Television Network, and Chesebrough-Pond's Manufacturing Company. But Elder Hales never let work dominate his life, as so many executives do. Despite the enormous demands on his time, he stayed faithful to the more important commitments he made to his family and to his Lord.

So it was that Robert Hales, a business executive of international renown, made an unusual decision in the prime of his life: He left the corporate world to give his all to the church. When Jesus said "Come, follow me," Robert Hales left his nets straightaway and became a fisher of men.

Elder Hales was called to become the presiding bishop of the church in 1985, overseeing the church's vast charitable network. As bishop, he used the skills of a business executive not for profit but to help the least of those among us.

In 1994, Elder Hales was sustained to the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, a church position he held for 23 years until his passing just days ago. From this position as a watchman on the tower, he boldly proclaimed the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and he also spoke out on such pressing societal issues as religious freedom. He saw that the erosion of religious belief in the United States was quickly devolving into social and political intolerance for religious people and institutions. But this prediction did not lead Elder Hales to despair, no; instead, he redoubled his efforts to edify the next generation—the young men and women who were in the preparatory period of life, as he termed it.

His addresses and sermons were full of moral exhortation and practical advice on living well. Don't walk, run to holiness, he urged his brothers and sisters in faith. Elder Hales knew that holiness is an activity, a pursuit to which we must consecrate our whole lives running the race and enduring to the end.

Through his example and through his words, Elder Hales taught that virtue is not just a good intention but a good deed reinforced and compounded by past deeds.

Elder Hales urged young men and women to embrace the joys of adulthood through marriage, child-rearing, and responsible citizenship. He knew that the way to true happiness lies in those sacrificial activities, not the selfish lifestyles that tempt so many today.

During one memorable address to the General Conference of the church, Elder Hales recounted the advice he received as a boy when he had been tempted to make a poor decision: "Robert," his father had said to him, "straighten up and fly right!" From the testimony of his life, it is clear that Elder Hales honored his father's advice in the Air Force, in the workforce, in the household, and in the church. Elder Robert D. Hales flew right. Now he has returned with honor to be embraced by his Heavenly Father.

Thank you, Madam President.

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. LANKFORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I want to be able to give a quick update to this body on a conversation that started yesterday and has been ongoing for months about Russia and their interference in our elections and how they are trying to engage with us in a way that much of Europe has seen for decades but that we just haven't seen in the United States.

Yesterday, Senator BURR and Senator WARNER stood up and gave an update of where we are in the status of the investigation of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. They walked through some of the statistics. We have done over 100 interviews. We have 4,000 pages of transcript from those interviews. We have 100,000 documents that we have gone through so far, and there is more to go. We have completed some areas where we have interviewed everyone who we could possibly interview in that area. In other areas, as we do one interview, they quote a couple of other people, and we chase down those individuals, and it continues. So parts of the inves-

tigation are not done at this point, but some of it is.

Several aspects are clear from the investigation, though, again, it is not complete, and we will have a final document at the end. Some of the areas that are clear are that Russia was trying to use active measures to engage us in our last election. That part is very, very clear.

The question comes for many people: Why would they do that? Quite frankly, this is the way Russia has worked for a very long time—this asymmetric warfare they do where they try to constantly interfere in other people's thoughts and conflicts. They have done it across Europe for a long time. They are now doing it here.

Some of this is a product of Russia's having a very weak economy and trying to find some way to bolster themselves up. In the last 2 years, the Russian ruble has dropped 40 percent in value. As they struggle with low oil prices and struggle in the way they function with their government with the oligarchs and have a select group of people who can succeed and other folks who continue to struggle around the country and as they struggle under that system where they have fake elections and such, they try to reach out to other countries and try to interfere in our elections to make us look like them.

We have a free press that they try to engage in. We have free speech that they don't have in Russia. We have freedom of religion, which they don't have in Russia. We have the ability to be able to have disputes on political issues. They clearly don't have that in Russia. If you disagree with leadership in Russia, you will end up in prison. If you disagree with leadership in the United States, you will end up on TV. It is very different to be in an open society like ours. But they reach into what we consider a strength and try to make it our weakness.

We are going to try to get the facts out on this over the next several months as we work through this process. We are going to expose what Russia is really trying to do. Do they use some overt propaganda networks like Sputnik Radio and RT? Is their Russian propaganda on multiple cable and satellite channels throughout the United States? Their version of the facts are designed to create discord in our Nation. That is what they do.

They also have ways that are not quite as overt. They reach in on social media platforms. They have their trolls in Russia who have thousands of fake accounts on Facebook and Twitter and other social media apps. They use those thousands of apps to search around any news in America and find a place where there is conflict in America and then try to amp up the volume.

To be clear, the Russians are not creating conflict in America. We have plenty of it. We disagree on issues. Again, it is our free society. When we disagree on something, we disagree on

it publically and sometimes loud. That is who we are as Americans. We try to work things out, sometimes at a high volume. But just like two kids who are fighting on the playground in the fifth grade—remember those two kids that started a fight and their friends were watching them? Then, eventually, someone on the other side of the playground started yelling “fight,” and the crowd started forming. The Russians aren’t starting the fight. They aren’t even in the fight. They are the kids on the far side of the playground, trying to get more people to run to the fight. They are not starting the Twitter wars and the battles, but they look at where America is divided, issues like race. Their troll farms will try to find areas where we disagree, such as areas of race, and reach in and try to amplify the volume on that by repeating accusations and by trying to be even more hostile online. They are trying to stoke disunity in our Nation.

It is important that we know that every time you see something with a high number of hashtag counts that goes up, it is not always Americans who are pushing that up. Occasionally, it is an outside body trying to raise the volume and make a conflict look even bigger than it already is in America because they are into sowing discord. That is what they love to do. That is what the rest of the nations have seen them do. We should be very clear that the Russians are trying to continue to sow chaos into us.

They have reached into our election systems. In the previous couple of weeks, the FBI notified 21 different States that during the last election season, the Russians tried to interfere in their election process as a State. Now, that doesn’t mean they did interfere. That means they reached in and tested systems. That means they tried to go into voter databases to see if they could access a voter database to see who was registered to vote. They tried to get into a secretary of State’s office in a local State to see if they could figure out how they do their elections. That means they reached into systems in States to see what voting machines they used and if they tried to connect them in. They were trying to find out how they do elections, learn as much as they could about their process, and see how far they could get.

Through all of our work, we have yet to find a single vote that was changed. The Russians didn’t get into voting machines. They didn’t alter the election in any way, but they were constantly probing through multiple States to see what they could get access to.

Now, it is my belief that they are preparing for something else. They are trying to see what they could get access to in the last election to see if they could get back into it and do even more in the next election. We should be aware of that. We should be aware not only of their propaganda, but we should be aware that they are going

after our elections to see if they can find a way, at the end of the election, to make us doubt the outcomes.

What can we do about that? I will give you several ideas. One of them, I would say, is that we need to protect the primacy of States running the elections. There is absolutely no need for the Federal Government to go to States and take over their election process. It is a constitutional protection that those States have to be able to run their elections, but every State is also responsible to do it. Of the 21 States that I noted here that the Russians tried to engage in, they couldn’t get to a single voting machine. The States are already doing a good job, but they need help.

There is no reason the State of Oklahoma should have to work alone to be able to protect itself from the Russians trying to invade it in the cyber attack. They are going to need some allies to come along with them, but the States should still be able to run the system. There should be more sharing between the State and the Federal Government. There should be an opportunity for the Federal Government to be able to say to a State, earlier than 10 months after the election: Hey, you are being hacked. For the FBI to notify States a couple of weeks ago that they were hacked in the 2016 elections is a little late. When it is occurring, we need to have that engagement between State IT folks and Federal IT folks. We need to be able to have that conversation as it is ongoing so the State can take protective measures as it is occurring. We need to have that cooperation between States and the Federal Government. We need to be able to help States come up with ways they can audit their system after the election is over.

When every election occurs, you should be able to audit it and make sure the machines that were running the election actually were not hacked. You can verify that. In Oklahoma, we have optical scanners. You fill out a paper ballot. You run it through an optical scanner at the end of the election time, and they can count everything from the optical scanner. If there is any question, they can go back to the paper and actually do a hand count. We can literally audit our elections and their process. It is a safe system that we have set up in our State. Every State does it differently, but I would encourage every State to set up a system where they can audit their system.

We know this year that the Russians were trying to engage in our election. It could be someone else who could do it. Any number of groups could try to interfere in our process. It is basic common sense to say we should have a system of elections we can actually audit. Perhaps Russia, in the days ahead, hopes that our Nation will be more like theirs. We will not be.

We are the longest constitutional Republic in the world. We still need the world. We still put out our values about free speech, free press, freedom

of religion, and opportunities for individuals to actually engage and to have conflict with their own government and to be able to disagree publically on things. We still can disagree with each other. We need to be aware that they want to turn us into them. I would hope for the sake of the Russian people, in the days ahead, that they could be more like us.

Ronald Reagan told a story about a friend of his who had a conversation with a Cuban refugee fleeing from communism and oppression in Cuba in 1964. He said that his friend, this Cuban refugee, said:

If we lose freedom here, there is no place to escape to. This is the last stand on Earth.

We are still a role model for the rest of the world. As much conflict as we have with each other, we are still a role model. I have no issue disagreeing at times with people on this floor. We can have our disagreements, but I don’t want the Russians to interfere in our disagreements. They can keep their business over there. In the days ahead, we will continue to expose the things they are doing. So they can back off and go bug someone else because we are akin to what they are doing.

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. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

EQUIFAX BREACH

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I say to the Presiding Officer—and the Senator who is about to become the Presiding Officer—I appreciated the work of you two together, in tandem, today for two nominees in front of the Agriculture Committee. I thank you.

(Mr. SASSE assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, I rise to talk for a moment about a hearing yesterday, which the Presiding Officer sat through, too, with the outgoing CEO of Equifax. We know what happened with Equifax, yet we really don’t know entirely what happened. We know there was a breach of Equifax’s information, and 145 million Americans—more than half of the adult population in our country—had their data breached. Criminals will now have access to the data of far too many Americans.

I am hopeful because I and Senator CRAPO, the chairman of the committee, and others on the committee were pretty unhappy—not to speak for others, certainly, but we were pretty unhappy with Equifax’s performance yesterday because we didn’t get a lot of answers to a number of our questions.

When you think about what we do with medical language, with our personal medical information, we have laws to say that our personal medical information belongs to us. We, of

course, can share it with a hospital or a doctor or whomever we want, but our doctor can't share it with other doctors without our permission. Our hospital can't share it with other hospitals without our permission. But our personal financial data doesn't fall into those categories.

We know how this happens. Equifax is a company that many have rarely thought about. A lot of people have never thought much about it, and many have never really explored who they are. Equifax is a company in Atlanta. There are three data agencies like this. They get your data without your permission. They get it from a utility company or from a bank or from somebody else. They have two jobs: to collect your data and then to protect your data, your personal financial data.

This company—this CEO has been paid \$69 million over the last 3 years. The CEO we met with, who has retired, has been compensated very generously. Who knows if he will end up getting bonuses and golden parachutes and all? The American public has come to unfortunately expect that these CEOs will abuse the public trust.

Look at what happened at Wells Fargo, creating all kinds of accounts for people who didn't even want those accounts, who didn't even know they were having those accounts opened. And look at Equifax.

In far too many cases, these companies don't protect our information the way they have promised they would. It makes all of us, the 145 million, subject to some kind of criminal activity in all kinds of ways—to violate our privacy and to take advantage of us financially and all the identity theft and all the things that come with that.

If you were a student at Bowling Green State University who graduated and you miss a student loan payment after you have graduated, you get your credit dinged by Equifax. If you are a homeowner in Mansfield, OH, or in Ravenna, OH, and you miss a monthly payment or a couple of monthly payments, you get your credit dinged. You are held accountable by Equifax, but Equifax hasn't really been held accountable much by anyone.

The cynicism people in this country have toward our financial system, toward Wall Street—then we see Wells Fargo do what they have done; then we see Equifax do what they have done. It is time for Congress to push away these special interest groups that have far too much influence in this body.

The White House has not been helpful. The White House looks like a retreat for Goldman Sachs executives, with all the people around the President who do the bidding of Wall Street and protect far too many of these Wall Street firms and Wells Fargo and the Equifaxes of the world.

I am hopeful that we will sit down in a bipartisan way and begin to figure out what to do here. Maybe we do consider the protections we have for peo-

ple's medical records—we ought to have the same protection for their financial records. It simply makes sense, and I am hopeful we can come to a solution.

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

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

PUERTO RICO RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today, as I have on so many occasions, to give voice to the 3.5 million Americans who call Puerto Rico home. Their lives have been turned upside down by Hurricane Maria, and now more than ever, they desperately need to be heard. I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in amplifying the voices of millions of Puerto Ricans calling out for help and the millions here on the mainland who have yet to hear from their families.

Here on the floor with me today are aerial photos of the destruction caused by Hurricane Maria, the astounding damage I saw firsthand when I toured Puerto Rico by helicopter on Friday, pictures largely taken by me.

Take this collapsed bridge in the municipality of Utuado, situated in the central mountains of Puerto Rico. Every day, the 30,000 Americans who live in Utuado depend on these bridges to cross the beautiful rivers that run through it, but today those 30,000 Americans are secluded, waiting in the dark, and wondering when help will arrive.

Images like these have stayed with me from the moment I left Puerto Rico, and I share them today because the people of Puerto Rico need our collective voices and support to stop this humanitarian crisis from devolving into a full-blown American tragedy.

This is another example of some of the devastation of a large number of homes in a community.

If we hope to overcome the monumental challenges before us, we need a full grasp of the reality on the ground. I thought that is why President Trump went to Puerto Rico this week—to get a dose of reality. Instead, the President continued to feed on his own warped version of reality. The President told the people of Puerto Rico that they should be “very proud” that the death count was only “16 versus literally thousands of people” who died in “a real catastrophe like Katrina”—a real catastrophe like Katrina. And certainly that was a catastrophe, but this is no less real for the people of Puerto Rico. Yet, moments later, the AP reported that fatalities in Puerto Rico have tragically risen to 44. And while I pray it is not the case, I fear that it may be even worse, because we have secluded communities that still have not

gotten access, so we don't know what is happening there.

In short, the situation is perilous, and we don't have a moment to waste.

Like many, I had hoped that during his visit to Puerto Rico, the President would take the high road and set a new tone after his administration's woefully delayed and inadequate response to Hurricane Maria. Instead, the President took victim-blaming to a whole new level. He told emergency responders and local elected officials: “I hate to tell you, Puerto Rico, but you have thrown our budget a little out of whack.”

Well, Mr. President, perhaps we have to dial back the budget-bursting, trillion-dollar tax cuts you want to give to billionaire families like yours, because it is going to take more than paper towels to help the people of Puerto Rico.

In this country, we don't turn our backs on Americans in need. We don't complain about how much it costs to restore power to hospitals or rebuild roads in ruin that connect people to their government and essential services or get clean drinking water and food and medicine to the hungry and the frail. We are the United States of America, and we are there for each other, whether it is Texas after Harvey or Florida after Irma or New Jersey after Sandy or Puerto Rico after Maria.

If you heard the President speak earlier this week, you would heard that everything is going great and that he in particular is doing the greatest job any President has ever done in the history of the world. The administration will tell us that the majority of hospitals are open but leave out the fact that many are running on emergency generators at significantly reduced capacity. They will leave out how the shortages of ambulances and fuel and functional roads have made getting to the hospitals nearly impossible. Even if you do find a way there, the hospitals might not have the medicine, supplies, or doctors you need.

The administration will boast that it has set up 11 distribution points for food, water, and other necessities, but what good is a distribution center that takes hours to reach and is out of supplies before you get there?

They will brag about how half of the people have access to running water but neglect to say that in some rural areas in the north, barely over 13 percent of people have access to running water.

They will boast about all of the buildings being inspected—something that even the Governor of Puerto Rico questioned—but look at this image I took 5 days before the President landed. This is just 25 minutes outside of San Juan. Hurricane Maria destroyed many of the wooden homes that populate the island and weakened many of its immense structures, as the picture showed that we had up before. Here is an example of it. So you see that all of

these homes are destroyed. Some of them are not made in the same way. Here is a cement structure that is also totally destroyed. I saw the same sights across Puerto Rico in communities near the capital, in the mountains, and along the coast.

What does all this tell us? It tells us an unfortunate truth: that the administration's response to this crisis has been woefully inadequate from the start.

For 2 weeks, Puerto Ricans cried out for help—help accessing clean water, help powering hospitals, help feeding families. Yet the President accused them—the victims of this historic natural disaster—of being ingrates clamoring for handouts. He dismissed the urgency of their situation, and he effectively called the mayor of San Juan another nasty woman who should pipe down.

Well, this is the mayor of San Juan, wading hip deep in water. Does this look like a woman who isn't taking responsibility? No. To me, it looks like a leader doing everything she can to save lives.

I knew from the start that we weren't getting the full picture, and because the administration went out of its way not to provide support for a bipartisan congressional delegation to visit the island, I decided to go myself. After all, it will be the responsibility of Congress to fund disaster relief and long-term recovery on these islands, and we need the facts in order to produce the right legislation. So last Friday, I boarded an Americans Airlines flight to Puerto Rico.

Now, let me be clear. I have visited the island of Puerto Rico I don't know how many times over the past 25 years, both in my official capacity as a Member of Congress and personally to vacation. It is no exaggeration to say that the island I saw on Friday is not the island I have known and loved. The lush, green, tropical landscape that comes to mind when we think of Puerto Rico was mostly devoid of life.

I met with the Governor of Puerto Rico. I spoke to local law enforcement officials, first responders, and Federal FEMA officials. With the help of the Governor's office and the Puerto Rico Joint Forces of Rapid Action—or FURA, as they are known on the island—I saw the damage by helicopter. I saw debris and mudslides and fallen trees on the inland streets, destroyed homes sprinkled with the occasional yet all-too-familiar blue of FEMA tarps. A dead green hue covered the landscape that was such a foreign sight to me that I caught myself thinking I was somewhere else.

This was an all-too-familiar scene—the scene of a strong cement structure of a building, on the surface impervious to the strong winds of a hurricane, yet now on the verge of sinking into the Earth. The hurricane eroded so much land that in some inner parts of the island, landslides have become the new norm. The people who live here may

never be able to return. Entire generations of close-knit communities may never be the same.

Despite these dire conditions, during my visit to Puerto Rico, I felt the spirit of community and commitments shared by so many Americans across the island. After Hurricane Maria, they woke to devastation, no communication, and the isolating affects of roads being cut off by fallen trees, electrical posts, and debris. As they wait and wonder when their government will come to their aid, they are doing everything they can to survive. They have taken matters into their own hands. They are clearing roads, sheltering relatives who lost their homes, and working together to care for the most vulnerable. So through it all, I saw the hard-working spirit alive in Puerto Rico that I see whenever I speak with Puerto Rican families there and across New Jersey, where so many of my constituents are mobilizing to send help as they anxiously wait to hear from their families.

Like so many Americans, I too worried about my family on the island. My brother faces health challenges, and I worried about his care. Fortunately, we had a brief moment to meet, and I was able to give him some supplies—help one person. But as tough as this situation was, he is one of the lucky ones. He lives in a suburb of San Juan which is relatively better off than the more remote, rural areas.

Let's look at a chart of our recovery status. Fifteen days after the storm ravaged the island, where does it stand? Well, 93 percent of our fellow Americans are still without power. I can tell my colleagues firsthand that the heat and the humidity from all of the water that came from Maria is stifling. It is oppressive. It is hard to breathe.

Sixty percent of Puerto Rico has no cell phone service, meaning people have no way of connecting to their families on the island and outside of the island or calling for help if they needed it. If they did, we could have pinpoint accuracy of search and rescue missions.

Day by day, fewer and fewer Puerto Ricans have access to clean, running water. From October 2 to October 3, the population with running water dropped from 29 percent to 13 percent.

The truth is, this situation would be unacceptable in any major city on the U.S. mainland, but, as the people of Puerto Rico know all too well, they don't get the same treatment as their fellow citizens on the mainland. The ugly truth is that for generations, Congress has treated the people of Puerto Rico not as our fellow Americans, not as people who have fought and bled for their country, like the famous Borinqueneers, an all-Puerto Rican infantry division, who received, recently, the highest decoration Congress gives collectively—the Congressional Gold Medal. They haven't treated them as first-class citizens but as second-class citizens.

Hurricane Maria didn't create this disparity, but it exposed the long-standing inequities that have hindered the island's success for generations. The people of Puerto Rico don't receive equal Medicaid funding, Medicare coverage, or access to tax credits. They aren't just numbers on a ledger; they are long-term care for a grandparent, treatment for a critically ill child, and a fair shot to make a living wage and raise a family.

This didn't happen overnight. These wrongs add up over time. As Governor Rossello said so eloquently:

I invite you to reflect on why Puerto Rico is in the current state of disadvantage and inequality. It's not something that happened just a few months or few weeks before this storm. It is a condition that has happened for more than a century in Puerto Rico.

I invite you to reflect on the reality that even after the storm hit Puerto Rico, even when it was evident it was a disaster in the United States, only half of our U.S. citizens knew Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens. So when Hurricanes Irma and Maria slammed into Puerto Rico, these disparities, these inequalities, were laid bare.

None of this should have taken the Trump administration by surprise. We knew the storm was coming. We knew for days that a category 5 hurricane was on a collision course with Puerto Rico, just as communities across the island were picking up the pieces after Irma. We have known for years about the island's aging infrastructure, like the downed power line pictured here.

In short, all of us knew Hurricane Maria was a recipe for disaster that would leave 3.5 million Americans imperiled, disconnected, and in the dark. It should not have taken the administration 12 days to issue a disaster declaration—something I called for—for 100 percent of the island because, as I saw on Friday, there is no community in Puerto Rico untouched by this tragedy. Focused leadership would have had a three-star general on the ground the moment the clouds parted, not 8 days after the storms struck.

We needed medical evacuation vehicles and vessels, aid and relief delivery systems on standby, the USNS *Comfort* ready for immediate deployment—something I called for. Instead, the administration told us helping Puerto Rico is hard because it is an island in a big ocean—but it happens to be an island of 3.5 million U.S. citizens.

We have no more time to waste. That is why it is so urgent that we take action now. If we could send 20,000 troops to Haiti, surely, we can get more boots on the ground saving American lives in Puerto Rico. We need more helicopters airdropping food and water to secluded communities. We need generators delivered and the repair of communication towers expedited.

It is up to the President to mobilize every resource possible—to save lives, to get the lights turned on, to rebuild bridges, to reach secluded communities, to reconnect families. We can't

afford to waste any more time, not when lives are on the line, not when elderly residents in nursing homes grow frailer by the moment, not when hungry American children have nothing to eat, not when communities are without clean drinking water for days on end. We need to keep the pressure on the administration.

That is why I wrote the President, urging that he activate the Defense Production Act of 1950 so the military could more quickly deliver vast private sector resources to those in need. That is why my colleagues and I wrote to the White House and urged FEMA to waive disaster relief cost sharing because, as the Governor told me: I have no revenue coming in. I have no revenue coming in, and the likelihood of revenue coming in, certainly in the short term, is not there. How do you acquire the 70 or 75 percent Federal assistance if you don't have the 25 percent to put up? That is why we have written the USDA asking that they use all available resources to get food to the people of Puerto Rico.

This is an all-hands-on-deck situation for the Federal Government, but Congress also has a responsibility to act. That is why I sent a letter to Leader MCCONNELL and Speaker RYAN urging that they bring forward an emergency supplemental aid package and fund community development block grants for disaster recovery. It is up to us in Congress to immediately authorize, not just the emergency funding needed to save lives in Puerto Rico but also the assistance needed for a full-powered recovery.

We must give Puerto Ricans the tools to rebuild. That means making sure Puerto Rico's financial control board gives the Governor the flexibility to spearhead this recovery. Board members of that control board should be on the island, assessing the damage, speaking to the survivors, allowing Governor Rossello to create a new budget that reflects Puerto Rico's post-Maria reality. The damage, by some estimates, could be as high as \$90 billion, so adjusting expectations and enabling flexibility is absolutely critical going forward.

I have said it before and I will say it again. The people of Puerto Rico must come before Wall Street creditors. As it turns out, this is one area where the President and I can find common ground. Just last night, he called for Puerto Rico's debt to be wiped out. I hope all of us—the administration, my colleagues in Congress, and the fiscal control board—can work together to jump-start Puerto Rico's recovery. That must include enabling flexibility, addressing the island's crippling debt, and ensuring that pensions are protected and paid. Imagine not getting your pension—no longer working, having no income, and then your pension is not protected. How do you make it? All of us in the Senate have a responsibility to stand with Puerto Rico. How we respond to this crisis will have pro-

found consequences, not just for the Americans who live in Puerto Rico today but for generations to come.

We need to pass a disaster package that matches the astounding damage suffered by the island. The photos I have brought to the floor today give a glimpse—not anywhere near the whole picture—of the devastation on the ground. It is not enough to reconnect a faulty, ailing power grid. It is time to be proactive and rebuild Puerto Rico so it is prepared for the next storm and for the 21st century. It is time to fix the underlying disparities which have hindered Puerto Rico's success. Otherwise, we will simply be rebuilding a broken foundation.

Let me close by saying, I remind my colleagues that Puerto Ricans are not just citizens of the United States—which, in and of itself, should speak to the compelling arguments we should be engaged in helping Puerto Rico as our fellow Americans. They have fought to defend our Nation from World War I to the War on Terror. Take a walk down to the Vietnam Memorial, and you will see Puerto Rican names engraved in that stone far in excess of the number of people proportionately to the American population. Throughout our history, Puerto Ricans have given their lives so they may remain part of the "land of the free." To this day, more than 10,000 Puerto Ricans serve in every branch of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Let's also remember that beyond the 3.5 million citizens living on the island, there are 5 million Puerto Ricans living in our States, in our congressional districts, and in our communities. In the aftermath of this unprecedented disaster, these Americans deserve the same rights, the same respect, and the same response from their Federal Government. That is what I told leaders from New Jersey's Puerto Rican community earlier this week—assemblymen and women, mayors, community leaders, and concerned citizens.

We all remember how hard it was to secure the funding we needed to rebuild New Jersey in the aftermath of Superstorm Sandy. We had to fight tooth and nail every step of the way, and, guess what, we had two U.S. Senators from New Jersey and 13 Members of Congress, joined by our colleagues from New York—two U.S. Senators from New York and a whole host of congressional Members as well as from Connecticut, which was also affected. It was an incredible time here to try to get relief.

Americans in Puerto Rico have no vote in the Senate, they have no votes in Congress, and the fight to rebuild Puerto Rico will be that much harder, but, as I have in the past, I intend to be their voice and their vote in the U.S. Senate.

Now is not the time to pretend like recovery will be a piece of cake. No one—not the Governor, not the President, not any one of us—should sugarcoat the human catastrophe playing out in Puerto Rico. It is time for hon-

esty about the conditions on the ground, the challenges we face, and the actions we must take.

Yes, Puerto Rico is an island in the middle of a very big ocean, but we are the most powerful nation on the face of the Earth. We have the most advanced military capabilities ever known and the most skilled Armed Forces in the world. We have to be there for 3.5 million Americans who are in need. We are the United States of America. We do the impossible. Give our men and women in uniform any mission, and they rise to the occasion.

If we conducted the Berlin Airlift, set up tactical operations in the mountains of Afghanistan, built green zones in Baghdad in the height of the Iraq war, then surely we can save the lives of Americans in danger, and surely we can save those lives and help rebuild Puerto Rico. We must not rest until every American is safe and the work of rebuilding is done.

I yield the floor.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I had expected to be able to vote today on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich to be Ambassador to the Holy See. Instead, I am in Las Vegas meeting with victims of and first responders to the deadliest mass shooting in modern U.S. history.

I support the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich to be Ambassador to the Holy See. The U.S. relationship with the Holy See is an important one and is best supported with a confirmed ambassador leading it. Ms. Gingrich's faith and engagement with the Catholic community will support U.S. ties to the Vatican.●

Mr. MENENDEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back on both sides.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Johnny Isakson, Patrick J. Toomey, Richard Burr, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, Richard C. Shelby, Cory Gardner, John Thune, James E. Risch, Deb Fischer, David Perdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 75, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Ex.]

YEAS—75

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Baldwin	Flake	Murphy
Barrasso	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Reed
Cantwell	Heinrich	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cardin	Hoeven	Rounds
Carper	Inhofe	Rubio
Casey	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Schumer
Collins	Kaine	Scott
Coons	Kennedy	Shaheen
Corker	King	Shelby
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Ernst	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Moran	Young

NAYS—20

Blumenthal	Hassan	Stabenow
Booker	Hirono	Tester
Brown	Markey	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Peters	Warren
Gillibrand	Sanders	Wyden
Harris	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	Heller	Nelson
Cortez Masto	McCain	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). On this vote, the yeas are 75, the nays are 20.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from North Dakota.

TAX REFORM

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I rise today to talk about what is really a “once in a generation” opportunity, and that is the opportunity we have

right now to reform our outmoded and complex Tax Code and also, most importantly, to provide tax relief for our Nation’s families, farmers, and small businesses.

Our Tax Code has not been updated since 1986. When you think about all that has changed over the last 30 years, you know that modern advances in technology have drastically revolutionized the way business is conducted. Today, the creation of the internet, substantially increased automation, and instant communications have created dramatic changes and in many ways have brought us closer in terms of communication and have interconnected our global economy in ways we never could have foreseen back in the 1980s, when we last reformed our Tax Code.

So it is past time—not time but past time—to modernize our outdated Tax Code to the 21st century. We must do so in order to ensure that American businesses can compete on the global stage, while providing tax relief to hard-working middle-class families who have been struggling to get and stay ahead over the last decade.

The recently released tax blueprint proposes sweeping tax reforms that will benefit working families and small businesses throughout the country while promoting job creation, economic growth, and global competitiveness. This country was built on hard work by individuals and families who strive each and every day to make ends meet to provide for their loved ones and to plan for retirement. The current Tax Code is complex and has many loopholes that do nothing to help our hard-working families keep more of their own hard-earned money. Our tax framework will help individuals and families in my home State and across this country to get ahead by generating new jobs through sustained economic growth while lowering the overall tax burden and putting more money back in the taxpayers’ pockets.

We do this in a number of ways: by doubling the standard deduction, by eliminating taxes on the first \$12,000 earned by an individual and \$24,000 earned by a married couple, effectively establishing a zero-percent tax rate as the bottom bracket—the bottom tax rate. That means that nearly 81 percent of North Dakotans who claim the standard deduction could see a significant increase in their take-home pay. That is true of other States across the country as well. Further, we are consolidating and lowering the tax rates across the board while simplifying the Tax Code to make it fairer for every-

body. At nearly 70,000 pages long, it is no wonder that Americans currently spend 6 billion hours a year complying with the Tax Code. In fact, 94 percent of taxpayers choose either to pay someone else or to use software to prepare their taxes because of the complexity of our Tax Code. Our goal for tax reform is to allow the vast majority of

Americans to file their tax returns on a single page—a simple calculation, something they can do themselves. We want to reduce the cost and stress that many Americans feel during tax season.

Further, our tax framework aims to create greater opportunities for small business owners, farmers, and others to help grow our economy and be more competitive than ever before. While we focus on a business friendly State in North Dakota—we have a very business friendly climate—the Federal tax continues to place an undue burden on the nearly 71,000 small businesses that operate in our State, which is more than 95 percent of all of the employers in the State. Again, this is something that applies across the Nation. The driver of our economy, the backbone of our economy is small business. They are the job generators. They are the job creators. We have to do more to help them do what they do, which is to create jobs and to grow our economy.

The same applies to our family farmers. My State alone has more than 30,000 family farms and ranches. Their marginal tax rate can reach as high as almost 45 percent, nearly twice the average rate of the rest of the industrialized world. That creates real challenges. This tax framework follows the example we have set in our State by restoring economic opportunity, by lowering the tax burden, and by enacting a pro-growth tax code.

Economists in general agree that high corporate taxes reduce wages to workers, raise costs to consumers, and reduce returns on retirement savings. That affects all of us. Maintaining high tax rates does nothing to improve the fairness of our system. It only punishes everyday citizens and reduces economic opportunities for all Americans.

For far too long, our Tax Code has incentivized American companies to send jobs and investment overseas, instead of keeping them here at home—keeping that investment, keeping those jobs here at home. Consequently, large multinational corporations now hold approximately \$2.6 trillion overseas. That is money that could be repatriated back to the United States for investment in American jobs here at home. Our framework would end the loopholes and the incentives that keep foreign profits offshore by moving to a territorial tax system and encouraging repatriation of these offshore funds, bringing that investment back to America. This is about getting the American economy going again and creating jobs and opportunity here at home rather than overseas.

It is vital that we advance a comprehensive tax reform that simplifies the IRS code and simplifies rates. Putting more money in the pockets of working individuals and families and empowering private investment will drive domestic job creation and increase wages through higher demand for labor and lower business costs. All the while we can ensure stable government revenues through a broader tax

base, a growing economy, and a more efficient tax system. That means that we will continue to be able to fund our priorities as we work to get our debt and deficit under control.

Ensuring U.S. competitiveness in the global marketplace and providing tax relief to middle-class families will benefit both current and future generations. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together to get tax reform done for the people of my State of North Dakota, for their respective States, and for Americans across this entire country.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, in many ways, the Children's Health Insurance Program has been an outstanding example of what a bipartisan, democratic process can accomplish. Twenty years ago, President Bill Clinton worked with a Republican majority in both the Senate and the House of Representatives to successfully pass the Children's Health Insurance Program into law. That legislation passed with 85 votes in the Senate—an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote—to recognize the simple fact that all children born in this great country of ours should have healthcare coverage.

The Children's Health Insurance Program, along with our Nation's community health centers, has more often than not seen great bipartisan support. As Members of Congress, we have always come together and understood the importance of these programs, and we have done everything we can to ensure that quality, cost-effective care is available to millions of Americans. Unfortunately, as I stand here today, funding for both the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers has expired.

The Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, provides healthcare coverage to over 100,000 children in my home State of Michigan and more than 9 million children nationally. In addition, community health centers serve as the primary medical home to over 600,000 Michiganders and more than 20 million individuals across our country. For people living in rural and underserved areas, their community health center is their doctor's office and often their only choice when it comes to care close to home.

We have already passed the deadline to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program and the Community Health Center Fund. We have passed the time to act. We should not wait any longer to provide certainty to the millions of children and their families who depend on CHIP and to the Americans who will lose access to care if their community health center is closed.

We are already seeing the impact of our inaction in the CHIP program. Several States have begun to warn that

they may be forced to end enrollment of new children, cut back services, or end their programs altogether if we do not act soon. Independent experts estimate that at least 10 States could completely run out of funding for their Children's Health Insurance Program before the end of the year, while funding for the remaining States' programs would not be very far behind.

This is not a responsible way to govern. I have heard from physicians in my State, especially in rural communities, who fear that this lack of action will mean great harm to the patients they serve. I have heard from pediatricians who know firsthand what the end of CHIP would mean for Michigan's children. As our country grapples with what we can do to expand mental health treatment and address the expanding opioid epidemic, letting these programs lapse would be a huge step in the wrong direction. This unnecessary uncertainty has already forced some community health centers to contemplate staff hiring freezes and layoffs. It is certainly harming their day-to-day operations. It has made it difficult for them to recruit new doctors, and it has made it harder for their offices to obtain loans to grow their practices and to serve more patients.

Luckily, this is a problem we know how to solve. I am proud to have co-sponsored bipartisan legislation with Senators HATCH and WYDEN that would ensure funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program. I also support similarly bipartisan legislation by Senators BLUNT and STABENOW to extend funding for our Nation's community health centers.

I welcome the fact that the Senate Finance Committee held a markup yesterday and was able to advance the bipartisan bill to fund the Children's Health Insurance Program. Now the rest of us in Congress need to do our job. Let's bring both of these bills up for a vote because, quite frankly, we cannot afford to wait any longer. Our Nation's children and millions of Americans who use community health centers as their primary medical home cannot afford to wait any longer. Historically, these programs have not been controversial to reauthorize, and they should not be now.

I am urging my colleagues to prioritize the children of our rural and underserved communities who will be hurt if we do not act soon. Let's do what is right for our country's children and families and pass this vital legislation as soon as possible.

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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. HEITKAMP and Ms. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 1942 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR. ALONZO B.

PATTERSON, JR., AND MRS. SHIRLEY PATTERSON

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wish to recognize an extraordinary individual in my State, along with his wife. I would like to take a few minutes today to recognize Reverend Dr. Alonzo B. Patterson, Jr., and Mrs. Shirley Patterson.

During the first week of November, Anchorage is going to host 4 days of events to commemorate the service of two of our most beloved community leaders, the Reverend Dr. Alonzo B. Patterson and his wife, Shirley Patterson. Next month, Reverend Patterson leaves the pulpit of Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church. This is a pulpit he has held for some 47 years. Mrs. Patterson, his wife of six decades, is to be recognized for her service as well.

Anchorage is one of America's great communities, and it is not uncommon to celebrate the retirement of a figure of Patterson's stature, but 4 separate days of events—that is huge, and it is a testament to the respect our community has for the Patterson family.

Think about this: Alaska has been a State for just 58 years. Reverend Patterson has had his pulpit for 47 years. And Shiloh is not Reverend Patterson's first pulpit in Alaska; it is his second. He came to Anchorage after founding the Corinthian Baptist Church in Fairbanks. Reverend Patterson grew up with Alaska, and Alaska grew up with Reverend Patterson.

Corinthian and Shiloh could appropriately be characterized as African-American churches. But for the African-American community in Alaska, they are far more than churches; they are centers of Black history in Alaska.

Zakiya McCummings interviewed Reverend Patterson earlier this year for an article published in the Anchorage Press, and in that interview, Reverend Patterson explained:

The church was, and always has been, the sanctuary in the Black community. It is the meeting place, the community center, the focus for support and help, the place you come to be important, the psychologist for your particular problem, the time to shout out your frustrations and the only place to be significant. You could be a Deacon or something in the church where in the rest of the community, you were just another Black person. The church was for us a panacea for many of the social ills that existed then and still have relevance.

Given the central role Reverend Patterson has played in Alaska's African-American community for most of our State's existence, it is no surprise that he is regarded as a historian of Black culture in Alaska. Ms. McCummings observed that it is a responsibility that he doesn't take lightly. Reverend Patterson told her:

I feel like I have to be the keeper of our historical plight and to speak to each generation in my time. It is a powerful responsibility because if I go to sleep on my watch,

then the next watch will have nothing to build on. . . . We're responsible that the gate remains open for the next generation.

Under Reverend Patterson's watch, there was much progress. In the 1960s and 1970s, Reverend Patterson recalled, "much of Alaska was small family businesses, including the banks. If you were not part of that family or their friends, you had a hard time getting a job.

Many of the jobs for African Americans were either construction or government jobs."

Reverend Patterson proudly recalls the first Black principal of a State elementary school, an African-American banker who was elected to the school board and subsequently to the Alaska Legislature, an African-American activist in the Fairview section of Anchorage who is regarded as the grandfather of the city's public transportation system. Today's African-American community is built on the foundation of these pioneers who endured.

Make no mistake about this, Alonzo Patterson was no mere spectator to all of this progress. He was an agent of change, rooted in his observation, and he stated: "In ministry there are no limits except the ones we set for ourselves." Under his leadership, Shiloh grew spiritually, physically, and fiscally, and would include a church school, a television ministry, and a jail outreach ministry.

On Shiloh's 29th anniversary, the mortgage note for the original structure was burned under the theme, "Burning to Build," and groundbreaking for a new educational wing commenced. There was more building to come. The Martin Luther King Jr. Family Life Center was dedicated on May 23, 1993. In 2001, Reverend Patterson spun off a new nonprofit organization, Shiloh Community Development, Inc., to serve youth, minorities, and the disadvantaged. Today Shiloh Community Development is well known for its youth mentoring program called Young Lions of Alaska.

He is a founder of Bridge Builders of Alaska, which celebrates the diversity of our communities and a powerful voice in Alaska's annual celebration of Dr. Martin Luther King Day. In 2015, Reverend Patterson was the keynote speaker at the King Day ceremonies on JBER. At that ceremony, he warned his audience that Dr. King's dream is at risk of dying. He said:

This dream is at risk if nothing is done, and nothing is holding us back but ourselves. Stop waiting for miracles; believe in yourself to make society better. Each of us can do our part, by loving and respecting others.

This is just one example of his powerful voice. Reverend Patterson's sermons were always inspiring, many legendary, and it explains why he is regarded as a pastor's pastor, growing not only his congregants but the generations of ministers who will follow in his footsteps. As one who has joined in the congregation there at Shiloh on numerous occasions, I can attest that

there was never a Sunday that I did not leave feeling inspired by the words of Dr. Patterson.

They aren't calling the appreciation festivities for Reverend Patterson a retirement ceremony. They are calling it a transition, probably because nobody believes Rev. Alonzo Patterson has any intentions of pursuing a future of leisure. Leadership and inspiration runs in Alonzo Patterson's DNA.

We wish him and Shirley well in their next calling, and we take comfort in the fact that their contributions to our community are far from over. November marks a transition, not a retirement—and certainly not a eulogy—for this extraordinary Alaska family.

On behalf of my Senate colleagues, I thank Dr. Patterson and his lovely wife Shirley for their good works, and thank them in advance for their continued leadership.

ALASKA AIRLINES "COMBI" PLANES

Mr. President, I know I have occupied a little bit of time on the floor this afternoon with a wide range of topics—from the tragedies that face many of our indigenous women to recognizing a prominent leader of the Alaska community. Now I wish to share a little bit of Alaska's history as we see a transition in aviation and transportation.

It is really the end of an era in my home State. On October 18, just a few days from now, Alaska Airlines will fly the final run of the uniquely Alaskan combi plane before retiring them and updating the fleet.

OK. She is going to make a floor speech about an airplane. Yes, I am going to make a floor speech about an airplane because this combi plane is a special Boeing 737-400, designed to carry up to 14,000 pounds of cargo and 72 passengers. It is called a combi because it is a dual-use plane, a combination of passengers and cargo. Alaska Airlines is the only major airline in the country to have these combi planes, and they were specifically designed for the special challenges of a very large State. Over their lifespan, they have delivered every imaginable thing via airplane in Alaska.

You have all heard me talk about the size of our State. The sheer size of this State presents logistical hurdles unlike anyplace else. I keep saying we are one-fifth the size of the country, and 80 percent of our communities are not connected by road. When we think about how we move around in our State, a postage stamp placed in the middle of an average sheet of paper represents the area a person can reach in Alaska by coastline, river, road, or railroad. The rest is only reachable by plane. You just have to fly everywhere. This being the case, it only makes sense to try to efficiently deliver people and goods to hub communities in Alaska. Alaska Airlines is looking to serve. This is not a promotion for them; it is a recognition that they needed to figure out how to move people and freight, and they reconfigured the aircraft to do this.

What makes these planes so special is, they can carry up to four large cargo containers. We call them igloos. These igloos load into the front portion of the aircraft, right behind the pilots. There is a simple divider between the cargo and the passengers. So they load the cargo up front, and the passengers come up the back on a set of steps, just like we used to do in the prejetway times. You load from the back, but your first 17 rows of a traditional aircraft would be occupied by cargo. If you have more cargo—if you are flying fish out from Cordova south or if you are flying your Iditarod dogs that have been dropped in Nome and need to get back to Anchorage and you need a lot of space for the animals, you have flexibility to move back and forth.

These have flown all over the State, up to Nome, on the Bering Sea coast, along the Arctic Ocean, to the oilfields in Prudhoe, and, most famously, in the "milk run" area. The milk run got its name because Alaska Airlines literally delivered the milk to the communities along the way, as well as other food stuff—all manner of goods and passenger. It is something that if you are from the southeast, we all know about the milk run. We all complain about the fact that it takes about 5 hours to get from Anchorage down to Juneau, if you have to go through Yakutat and Cordova and stop at each one. That is just the way it is. You bounce down from Cordova, Yakutat, Juneau, Ketchikan. Finally, you hit Seattle. You run into your sports teams, families are coming and going. These are the workhorses that are not only moving the passengers, they are moving the groceries, they are moving the mail, they are moving the medicine. They are moving it all.

When I say it moves everything, we have built up a little bit of history about how things move around. We have moved cows. We have moved cars. The picture I like best is moving the herd of Santa's reindeer. I think Santa was actually posed in this, but the reindeer were not. They needed to be able to move the reindeer so they hauled them in the front, situated them, and closed it off, and you have the passengers in the back. Whether you are moving reindeer, whether you are transporting an injured eagle to the Raptor Center in Sitka or letting the sled dogs hitch a ride back to Anchorage after they have made the thousand-mile trip to Nome, this is what we do.

The invention of the combi plane really highlights the unique needs and the parameters of daily life in the State. We are a long way from the lower 48. You can barely drive to any of the communities. If you are going to move goods, if you are going to move passengers, you are on an airplane. Whether it is Essential Air Services, bypass mail, air freight, these are the backbones of commerce in Alaska. This is our interstate. It is the interstate in the air.

Whether we are shipping our wild caught, sustainably managed salmon that people around the world love to eat, we ship that out. We ship in the toothpaste, the loaves of bread, and the basics that we need. Thanks to the combi, we have been able to do this with regular, reliable scheduled service in areas where the weather would usually chase off more. These are smaller aircraft. They can handle it all. The size of the combi allows them to land and take off in much more turbulent conditions than smaller propeller planes.

So it is a kind of bittersweet time for some of us who have grown up around these aircraft. As we think about the “only in Alaska” type of things, it is encouraging to know that this development of retiring the combi planes—the proposal is to replace them with separate, full-sized passenger and cargo planes. As a result of the increased demand for goods and passengers, we need more space on planes to deliver both. If updating the fleet means that we need and get more business in Alaska, I suppose that is a good thing for all.

There are many of us who are going to be bidding a fond farewell come October 18, which is the last scheduled flight for the combi. It is also Alaska Day in our State. I thank Alaska Airlines and those who fly these great planes and do so safely. They provide a level of service and have for so long. I thank them for what they have done over the course of so many years.

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

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

TAX REFORM

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, here is what is happening with so-called “tax reform.” Tonight, the Budget Committee is voting on a budget resolution that does two things.

First, it sets the spending limits for everything in the government—environment, energy, defense, healthcare, education, transportation, and so on.

Second, it includes something called reconciliation instructions that basically direct all of the committees to report back with legislation that either increases or decreases the Federal deficit by a certain amount. This time around, here is what they are doing—asking the Senate Finance Committee to draft legislation to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. Again, this is going to pass on a party-line vote, with Republicans prevailing, to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. This is what will start the tax reform process.

That is not all. Republicans still haven't given up on decimating our healthcare system. They are still trying to cut Medicaid and, this time,

Medicare, and they are going to use this tax bill. They are going to cut \$473 billion from Medicare at a time when our population is getting older and many seniors are already struggling. They are also going to cut \$1 trillion from Medicaid. This is the program that pays for one out of every two births in this country. It helps millions of families who have loved ones in nursing home care.

Last week, they tried to pass a healthcare bill that cut taxes. Now they are trying to pass a tax bill that will cut healthcare. Their proposal will, actually, increase the deficit by \$4 trillion. That is 12 zeros.

Here is what we could do with \$4 trillion. We could completely rebuild half of the airports in the United States. We could put 20 million people through 4 years of college. We could pay off the debt for every student loan.

Instead, the United States is going to be in the red by \$4 trillion, but after they cut \$1 trillion from Medicaid and one-half trillion dollars from Medicare, the party that has railed against the Federal debt and deficit will still add \$2.5 trillion to the deficit.

This is all so that they can give tax cuts to the richest people in the United States. I promise you, I understand that both parties are sometimes guilty of exaggerating and that sometimes both parties are guilty of relying on talking points and relying on caricatures of the other side, but you couldn't caricature this bill if you tried. This bill is already a caricature of what people say Republicans are all about, which is to shred the social safety net and provide tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans.

They are going to cut the corporate tax rate from 35 to 20 percent, and they are going to cut tax rates across the board, but the people who will actually benefit will be the people at the top. The Tax Policy Center, which is a non-partisan, highly respected group, has crunched the numbers, and they found that within 10 years, 80 percent of the benefits of this \$4 trillion tax bill will go to 1 percent of Americans.

Remember what is happening. We are borrowing a huge chunk of this, and whatever is not borrowed comes out of Medicare and Medicaid. So the programs that pay for women to give birth in a hospital or for elderly people to get healthcare will be decimated, and the wealthiest Americans will pay less in taxes. This is bad policy, not just for the people who work hard but for the whole economy.

I want to give you a specific example. Again, both parties rely on talking points, and both parties accuse each other of having the wrong set of ideas, but we have an example of what happens when you do this. This bill is actually modeled after what they did in the State of Kansas. The State government eliminated one of its business taxes, telling people that it would help the State's economy. Instead, the economy slowed down, which left them with

even lower tax revenues. They had to cut government programs, like education, and now people do not want to send their kids to Kansas public schools anymore because they do not have the resources to educate their children.

This is not a path that America should follow. Everyone needs to pay their fair share, and that includes big corporations and the people who are benefiting from the system and making millions of dollars every year, but in this proposal, they are the ones getting all of the tax breaks.

Companies already have huge tax breaks. Some corporations end up paying zero in Federal income tax every April 15 even though they are making healthy profits. They have teams of lawyers and accountants who help them dodge paying even a penny to the Federal Government. That is why corporate income taxes make up less than 10 percent of all of the revenue to the Federal Treasury. Meanwhile, at least 30 percent of the middle class will actually pay more if the Republicans succeed with their tax reform package.

Think about this.

Thirty percent of the middle class is going to see tax increases in their tax bills. Why? It is because they have to find some money to subsidize the tax cuts for the richest people. Some of the money will be found by borrowing; some of the money will be found by making cuts to Medicare and Medicaid; and some of the money will be found by increasing taxes on the middle class. One out of every two households with children will see its taxes go up under this plan. Increasing taxes for these people while decreasing them for big corporations is not a plan for economic growth. We have heard over and over that Republicans do not want to add to the deficit—I don't either—but this is, literally, what they are voting to do tonight.

Again, this is not a talking point. This is not a sort of rhetorical flourish. The bill, itself, provides for \$1.5 trillion worth of deficit spending. Yet it is not deficit spending on the military; it is not deficit spending on disaster response; and it is not deficit spending on Medicare or Medicaid or Social Security or any of the social safety net programs that they claim is the problem with the Federal budget. It is deficit spending for the purpose of a tax cut, 80 percent of which is going to 1 percent of the country. This is not conservative—certainly not fiscally conservative—and it will not help us to grow the economy.

It is no surprise that this policy is bad, because, again, the process has been so bad. With healthcare, they ignored regular order. They obliterated the committee process. They ignored Democrats. They ignored the way the U.S. Senate is supposed to work, and they failed. One Republican Senator says that he will not vote for anything that adds one penny to the deficit. Another Republican Senator said that he

will not do anything that does not cut taxes for everybody. It already does not meet that test. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle—Republicans too—have promised not to cut Medicaid or Medicare. It violates all of those promises.

If you did not like the ACA repeal because it cut Medicaid, guess what. This cuts Medicaid more. If you made a promise to your voters not to cut Medicare, you should be aware that this bill provides for one-half trillion dollars in cuts to Medicare. If you are railing against debt and deficits, this is the biggest budget buster that I have ever seen in my short, 5-year career in the U.S. Senate.

During the campaign, the President of the United States promised not to cut Medicare, and the senior Senator from Arizona has called for regular order. This violates every procedural and policy principle that has been articulated on this Senate floor since I have been here. I do not see a way forward on this legislation when it has been conceived in a purely partisan way. It will only take us deeper into dysfunction. For the sake of the Senate, let's stop going down this path. Let's restore regular order and work together on a bipartisan tax reform process.

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. SULLIVAN. Mr. 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 PASTOR ALONZO PATTERSON

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, nearly every week I have been coming down to the Senate floor to recognize someone in my State who has made a difference for Alaska and really has made a difference for all Americans. It is my favorite part of the week to actually come down and talk about Alaska to my colleagues in the Senate, to the folks in the Gallery, to the press, and to the American people watching. It is what I refer to as our time to talk about the Alaskan of the Week.

Many watching and on the floor and those who have visited our great State know that Alaskans think it is the most beautiful place in the world. There are natural wonders everywhere. We had a beautiful summer. We have resilient, warm-hearted, fiercely independent but accepting people. We have challenges in Alaska just like the rest of the country, but at the heart of our State are kind, generous people full of different cultures and backgrounds that we celebrate.

Most people don't know this about Anchorage, AK: My hometown is probably the most culturally and ethnically diverse city in the country. We have places of worship all over the city and the State that reflect that great diversity of Alaska and America.

One of the stalwarts of our faith community for the past 47 years has been Pastor Alonzo Patterson of the Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church, and he is our Alaskan of the week. Every Sunday he fills his church with spirit, joy, and gospel music punctuated by "amens" that float through the church, down the street, and work their way into our community and into our hearts. That is what he has been doing for 47 years. For decades, those sermons have inspired countless Alaskans to help feed the hungry, provide homes for those without, and strive to create a more just country, State, and society, and a more just community.

Let me tell you a little bit about Pastor Patterson. He was born in Wilson, LA, and raised in New Orleans. Like a lot of Alaskans, thousands of Alaskans, he joined the military and made his way up to Fairbanks, AK, in the 1960s, where he founded the Corinthian Baptist Church, and he ministered to the congregation there. Then, in 1970, he was called to Shiloh, one of the few African-American churches in Anchorage. He designed and rebuilt Shiloh at its current location, and under his leadership, Shiloh's membership, its facilities, and its energy took off.

He has conducted thousands of marriages and baptisms. He has given thousands of eulogies, celebrated graduations and anniversaries, counseled countless couples, people who are grieving, people who are rejoicing, people who are suffering, and he has helped turn that into action—not just for the African-American community but for all people and all races in our community and in our State.

Pastor Patterson told a reporter:

The church was and always has been a sanctuary in the Black community. It is the meeting place, the community center, the focus for support and help, the place you come to be important, the psychologist for your particular problem, the time to shout out your frustrations and the only place to be significant.

He continued:

You could be a Deacon or something in the church where in the rest of the community you were just another Black person. The church was for us a panacea for many of the social ills that existed then and still have relevance.

That is what he talked about. That is his heart and soul, how he saw his church and congregation. Thanks to Pastor Patterson and Shiloh, the city is a more inclusive place for all. He has helped heal those social ills for thousands of our fellow Alaskans.

One of his friends, Celeste Hodge Growden, a member of the church, said:

He and the church have led the way for a lot of things that have been accomplished here [in Anchorage]. Pastor Patterson always says, "leaders lead." That is the way he has lived his life. He is not in the background.

During election time, Pastor Patterson organizes a huge "get out the vote" campaign. He was instrumental in getting a Martin Luther King memorial in Anchorage—a 10-year-long endeavor.

She also talked about the groups he chaired, founded, and led beyond his congregation, including Bridge Builders of Anchorage, the March of Dimes Foundation, the Martin Luther King Jr. Foundation of Alaska, and the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance of Anchorage.

You know, with leaders like this, the list goes on and on. In addition to Corinthian Baptist Church in Fairbanks and Shiloh in Anchorage, Pastor Patterson also planted Eagle River Missionary Baptist Church and Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church of Palmer.

I have been uplifted to the core when my wife Julie and I have gone to Shiloh and listened to Pastor Patterson preach and listened to the beautiful—and I mean beautiful—Shiloh choir sing. It is a spiritual and energizing experience like no other. I love attending services at Shiloh.

On November 5, 2017, Pastor Patterson's 80th birthday, he will be giving his last sermon as pastor of Shiloh, and I certainly plan on being there. He is stepping down for Pastor Undra Parker, who will be the new and dynamic leader of Shiloh—another great Alaskan, another veteran—and I know he is going to do a great job. But of course it is a bittersweet time for Shiloh's parishioners because of the foundation Pastor Patterson built.

The church, the singing, and the amens will continue on Earth and the church in Anchorage, AK, as it is in Heaven. God bless Pastor Patterson, his wife of 61 years, First Lady Shirley Patterson, and the congregation of Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church for all they have done and continue to do for our community.

Congratulations to Pastor Patterson for being our Alaskan of the Week.

Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about my Members on the other side of the aisle who are doing something that is just not helping the United States of America right now; that is, obstructing progress with regard to the new administration.

I understand that right now my party is in the majority, and to be honest, I have been someone who thinks we should spend a lot more time here in the Senate, working in the Senate and getting things done. We have a lot of work to do. But I see that people back home can get frustrated with some of the lack of progress, and some of that we can address by spending more time in this body.

Some of the questions that are coming out are about why things aren't getting done. It is a good question. Answers can be complicated, but what it mostly boils down to is that a lot of issues in this body—a lot—rely on consensus. The rules were carefully constructed so that the minority has a say in the legislative process. For the most part, I believe that is a good thing. As a former President once pointed out, we are not a red or blue America; we are the United States of America.

With that said, the people did elect us to come here and start getting

things done. Implicit in their votes for a new President and a new administration was to be able to put people in the Federal Government to work, to focus on growing the economy, and to focus on rebuilding the military after a 25-percent cut over the last 8 years, to focus on better jobs and higher wages.

Throughout history, whether it has been Republicans or Democrats, the minority party has understood this. When a new administration gets elected, they start to put nominees in place, and the Senate takes action. We hold hearings and we have votes to put Senate-confirmed officials in the Federal Government to work. If you don't like the person, you can ask them tough questions in hearings and you can vote against them on the floor of the Senate or in committees. But what we are seeing right now is pure obstruction. On every single nominee, the maximum amount of time is required before there is even a vote. This is something new. This is something different. In fact, the current minority leader said the following words in 2013:

Who in America doesn't think a President, Democrat or Republican, deserves his or her picks for who should run the Federal Government agencies? Nobody.

That was the minority leader in 2013. They were wise words then, but apparently he and his Members have forgotten those words.

I have some facts here on the board. At this point in time, 10 months into President Obama's Presidency in 2009, the Senate had allowed more than 318 nominees to be cast by a simple vote. The Senate only asked for a procedure known as cloture five times. Essentially, President Obama got elected, and the Senate Democrats and Republicans worked to get his team put in place. Yes, the Republicans did that. Certainly, I wasn't here then. They voted against some of these nominees, and that is fine. But what they did was they let them come to the floor for a vote.

In contrast to what I mentioned about President Obama's first year in office, only 100 of President Trump's nominees have been confirmed through voice vote. That is less than one-third of the courtesy given to President Obama 8 years ago. Cloture votes for Trump's nominees have been required for 100 nominees. Remember, I just said there were five for Obama's nominees 8 years ago. There have been 100 for Trump's nominees, and only 63 have been allowed by simple voice vote. What does that mean? It means that each vote requires a 2-day waiting period and then another 30 hours of debate. That is what it means.

The press won't write about it. My friends in the press sitting up here in the Gallery won't write about this. The contrast between the Trump treatment by the Senate and the Obama treatment by the Senate is incredible, and we don't hear a word out of the press on this. And this isn't partisan; this is just hurting the American people.

There was an election, and now we need to fill the government with people who can run agencies. With all due respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, they are not doing it. They are not allowing it.

We had a vote on an Eighth Circuit judge last week. It had to go through cloture. We essentially spent the whole week on this—2 days and 30 hours. The judge passed the Senate by a 95-to-1 vote. It was a 95-to-1 vote. He wasn't controversial at all so what was the point? The point was simply to delay.

Again, here is the difference. Nominations sent to the Senate are about the same. President Obama had more 8 years ago but not too many more. There were 520 versus 443 for President Trump confirmed. At this time during the Obama administration, there were 342. Trump has 163. So that is 66 percent for the Obama nominees 8 years ago and 37 percent for the Trump nominees.

The press will not write about it, but this is a disservice to Americans, whether you are a Democrat or Republican. I will just mention a few. We have had nominees, such as the Assistant Secretary for Health in Health and Human Services. It came out of committee several weeks ago. It is sitting on the floor. The Assistant Secretary of Health, it is not a controversial position for the company, but it is an important position. I bet that person is going to finally get passage from the Senate at some point by a big supermajority, but we are delaying it. We are delaying it.

I really would love it if the minority leader would come down, look at the American people, and just say: Here is why we are delaying. Here is why we are delaying. Explain it. They love to do this kind of stuff, procedural "dark arts," thinking people aren't watching. People understand this.

The head of a leading Democratic think tank told the press they intend to hold up and tie up floor time on every single Trump administration nominee. Now, if that happens, if they take the time for every nominee—there are over 1,000 who need Senate confirmation—and they take the entire amount of time they are allowed with cloture and other votes, if they don't extend the courtesy that was extended to President Obama when he was trying to put his team in place, the Trump administration will never have a team in place. It will literally be 4 years.

I hope today the press starts writing about this because the difference here in 8 years is quite remarkable and yet nobody is talking about it; that being that the minority leader and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle stop obstructing what every other administration has had in terms of a courtesy, which is, if you win the election, whether you liked it or not, you work with the other side in the U.S. Senate to get your people in place—Department of Defense officials, Department of Transportation officials, De-

partment of Health officials, Environmental Protection Agency officials. We have to get the country moving again, and the obstruction, which is unprecedented, by the minority leader and unfortunately many of my colleagues on the other side is only harming the American people. It is only harming the progress that the vast majority of Americans want, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. I am hopeful they are finally going to change and start moving forward nominations and letting us vote on them so we have an opportunity to actually get this country moving again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I would like to begin by talking about the recent tragedy in Las Vegas, the largest mass shooting in U.S. history, with at least 59 dead and more than 500 injured, including one Minnesotan who was injured and another who lost his life. So I join my colleagues in mourning for the victims and their families. They are and should be our focus at this time, as well as making sure those who were hurt get the best medical care this country can give.

As we look ahead, these events underscore the urgency to continue fighting for funding to better treat mental illness but also for sensible gun safety legislation, and I joined with some of my colleagues the day after the tragedy in Las Vegas to call for those changes. No one policy will prevent every tragedy, but we need to come together on commonsense legislation to save lives.

One place we discussed this week where we could come together—because we have in the past—is on background checks. My colleagues Senator MANCHIN and Senator TOOMEY, who are two A-rated NRA Senators, have already demonstrated that we can find bipartisan agreement on something as straightforward as background checks. I was very pleased they came together on this legislation, but the fact remains, the Senate's failure to pass that bipartisan compromise was disheartening—one of my more disheartening days in the Senate because I began my day that day with the families of the Sandy Hook tragedy, with the parents who had lost their little kids, with the parents who had come to this building to advocate for a bill, the background check bill, that they knew wouldn't have saved their child's life, but they knew it would have saved others. What we have seen with expanded background checks is they reduce suicides and they reduce domestic homicides by a fairly large number.

Our constituents agree that we should be able to find some agreement here, as the numbers have consistently shown that Americans across the political spectrum, including gun owners, support proposals to require background checks by wide margins. I have

a State, like the Presiding Officer's, where there are a lot of hunters. It is a proud tradition in Minnesota so I look at all these proposals and I say to myself: Does this hurt my Uncle Dick and his deer stand? For many of the ones I have looked at, the answer is clearly no, including the background check bill.

When I talk to law enforcement in my State, they stress the need to have effective background checks to stop felons, people with severe mental illnesses, and others prohibited under current law from accessing guns. These efforts do not have to infringe in any way on Americans' lawful right to own guns.

Another sensible measure is Senator FEINSTEIN's legislation to close a loophole that allows bump stop devices to convert semiautomatic firearms into weapons that work like fully automatic guns. Law enforcement officers have now recovered 12 of these devices from the Las Vegas shooter's room. I am a cosponsor of that bill, and I am encouraged that some of my Republican colleagues have agreed to look at this.

I hope we can find a path forward in the weeks ahead, not only with regard to this particular focus, the bump stock device legislation, but also on some of the other bills like the background check bill.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, I am here for another purpose today; that is, that we must get to work on other important business in the Senate. We need to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program and come together on bipartisan fixes to the Affordable Care Act. No parent should ever have to worry whether their child will have healthcare, but funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, expired over this weekend. CHIP is one of the great bipartisan success stories. Both parties have come together to support a program that provides healthcare to millions of children.

In Minnesota, these funds support coverage for 125,000 children. I heard from the children's hospitals and clinics of Minnesota just last week about many of the families who count on this program. While States like mine are finding ways to make Federal funding last a bit longer, since ours has already expired, every single day Congress doesn't act puts coverage of millions of children at risk.

There is already bipartisan work underway to keep this program going. Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN have introduced a bipartisan bill to extend CHIP for 5 years. In 2015, the last time we renewed this program, it passed the Senate with 92 votes—92 out of 100 votes. We should demonstrate that same bipartisan spirit again. The children in America are counting on us. We must act before it is too late or States like mine may be forced to make difficult choices about insurance

coverage for some of our more vulnerable constituents.

CHIP is one part of our healthcare system that is working. We should be doing everything in our power to protect it. So let's come together and pass this long-term reauthorization of CHIP.

Mr. President, CHIP is not the only area where we should be able to come together on healthcare. The American people want us to work together on bipartisan fixes to the Affordable Care Act. As I said the day it passed, it was a beginning and not an end. Any major piece of legislation like that needs improvements and changes. Let's work together on the bipartisan bills and ideas that have been put forward. Just like my friend Senator MCCAIN said, we could do better working together—Republicans and Democrats.

Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY have been holding hearings and discussions on commonsense solutions to bring down insurance costs over the past month. We had Governors here, and there were actually more Republican Governors in the room than Democratic Governors, as they embraced these suggested changes which include reinsurance. I note Senator COLLINS and Senator NELSON, a Republican and a Democrat, have a bill together that would do something on that front.

I look at what has been done in Alaska—I see my colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI here—and what has been done in Minnesota when it comes to reinsurance, and we have seen some of the rates go down, not to where we need them to go, but there has been a decrease in the amount of rates. We would like to see that on a national basis, and that is why I am such a strong supporter of Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY's work.

Mr. President, finally, we need to be doing something on the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs. People such as Kim from Plymouth, MN, is struggling to afford her insulin because it has gone up three times. She keeps the injector with a few drops of insulin from day-to-day so she can get by. That is why I think we should have Medicare Part D negotiations. I have a bill that now has 33 cosponsors that lifts the ban that makes it illegal for 41 million seniors to negotiate the prices of drugs. Seniors can be a pretty stubborn and very vocal group. Why don't we let them unleash their power and allow Medicaid to negotiate prices?

Senator GRASSLEY and I have a bill to stop pay for delay, where major pharmaceutical companies are paying off generics to keep their products off the market. I have a bill with Senator GRASSLEY, Senator LEAHY, and Senator LEE—the four of us lead the bill—the CREATES Act, which makes it easier to get more generic competition in the market. We also—MCCAIN and I, and Senator LEE and I—have bills that allow for safe drugs to come in from other countries to again create more

competition to bring the price down. When the prices of four of the top best selling drugs in America have gone up over 100 percent, I don't think we can just sit here and do nothing anymore.

I bring up these efforts because, for the most part, they are bipartisan—the work of Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY, the bills that have been introduced to do something on prescription drugs. Let's get moving on that and let's reauthorize CHIP. The last time it passed the Senate with 92 votes.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 323, 324, 325; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc, with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is my hope that we will be able to come to agreement with regard to the nominees whom I have just asked for consideration. These are individuals who have been moved out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to be named to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. This is a Commission that has been without a functioning quorum for months on end. They have just recently been able to achieve that quorum, but they are not yet to a full complement.

We worked hard to reach an agreement with colleagues so these names could advance so the FERC could get to work in an expeditious manner. There is much to be considered. The work that has piled up, that has cost our economy, that has cost our country over these many months, as we have seen these delays when you don't have a functioning FERC, has been considerable. We want to try to reach agreement, but I am disappointed that we are not going to be able to advance them this afternoon.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

WILDFIRE FUNDING

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, 4 weeks ago, I stood here on the floor of the Senate and called for increased funding to fight the wildfires. This is just one of the dramatic pictures of Oregon ablaze. It is thousands and thousands of acres.

I had the experience of driving roughly 350 miles in my State and never escaping the smoke from the fires that were in every single corner and in every quadrant of the State of Oregon. We have seen the challenge of Mother Nature at work this year with Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria hitting in Texas, Florida, and Puerto Rico. But let's not forget the incredible damage being done in Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington by these extraordinary fires.

Over the last decade, we have seen an average of 50,000 fires in America each year. They destroy and burn up more than 5 million acres, but this year the count is well over 8 million acres and counting. In Oregon, we normally have fires that burn, on average, about 500,000 acres, but this year we are well over 600,000 acres and counting.

As a result of these raging fires, we have many communities that have been so powerfully impacted and so many forests destructively impacted. We should stop and ask: What can we do better in terms of our forests and our communities? That is why I am taking to the floor right now.

The first thing we need to do is to end fire borrowing. This is where the U.S. Forest Service, in order to pay for fighting these fires, proceeds to borrow from every other account. This has become all too common. What are those other accounts? They are the hazardous fuels funds, forest management funds, forest restoration funds, forest conservation funds, road maintenance funds, and funds that are designed to prepare for future timber sales.

All of that does a lot of damage to the preparation. So the fires are more resilient and aren't susceptible to this type of firefighting. We have seen, on average in the last decade, a cost of fighting fires across the country of about \$1.6 billion. But this year, we are over \$3 billion—almost double. So even though the Appropriations Committee had wisely put in a buffer of several hundred million dollars to prevent fire borrowing, those funds were long ago wiped out.

So there we were 4 weeks ago. I was working to say that now that we are over the allotted funds for the year, let's immediately get more funds that can be used to backfill this shortage in September. I thank all of my colleagues for the fact that those funds were included in the continuing resolution. We successfully provided a bridge so that firefighting could continue and so that the fire borrowing was quickly repaid.

But that is not a permanent solution—to try to legislate or to backfill on a rapid basis. Indeed, when we have these kinds of fire seasons, it is like other natural disasters. It is like tornadoes and hurricanes and floods. So we need to have a FEMA-style backup for those worst ever fire seasons. That is what my colleagues Senator WYDEN and Senator CRAPO—bipartisan teamwork—have been putting forth. It is

called the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act of 2017. It says that when we reach a certain level of funding for fighting fires, the balance will go to a FEMA-style fund. That is exactly the way it should be done.

It has been estimated in the past that if just the top 1 percent or 2 percent of the worst fires were funded in FEMA-style fund, we would never have had fire borrowing in the past. But the most relevant kind of crisp and clean way to do that would be to adopt this bill Senator WYDEN and Senator CRAPO have put so much work into and which I am certainly pleased to cosponsor. That would be very useful, and we should do that now.

We should respond while the memory is fresh and, actually, while fires are still burning in State after State—certainly burning in my home State of Oregon. Then we should recognize, too, that this terrible fire year has done so much damage to so many communities. We have communities where the roads have been cut off. We have communities where the tourists disappeared because of the smoke, or other economic enterprises had to shut down for an extended period.

So as we assist those communities hit by Harvey and hit by Irma and hit by Maria, let's also help those communities that were hit by this year's extraordinary fires. That would mean strengthening the Small Business Disaster Loan Program. That would mean taking the additional funding for the USDA Emergency Community Water Assistance Program, and, certainly, it would mean making additional community development block grants available to the communities impacted by these fires. Let's not forget those communities as we provide assistance in funding to the communities affected by the hurricanes.

Then we also need to address the fact that many assets in our forests were scorched by these fires. There are trails that have to be repaired, roads that have to be repaired, watershed repairs to avoid landslides, facilities that were scorched and burned, and wildlife and fish management restoration, including critical sage grouse areas.

I was up visiting the incredible waterfall, the Multnomah Falls. They were explaining that several of the trails have bridges—there are so many bridges on the trails in Oregon—and that the fire had burned some of the understructure. So from above it looked like the bridges were safe, but they weren't safe. They can't reopen those trails until they get support to do all these repairs. The Forest Service has estimated that it will take \$150 million to restore the damage done to the Forest Service's infrastructure.

So we should make that happen as part of this bill. Then, we should turn to forest fire resilience. We have 2 million acres in need of fire prevention efforts in Oregon. Actually, we have far more of that in need of fire prevention, but we have nearly 2 million that have

already passed through environmental approval for work to reduce the hazardous fuels that are on the floor of the forest, and we need to thin these forests.

You can imagine that when you have clearcuts and those clearcuts are replanted, the trees grow back very close together. In a short amount of time, those forests are very good for fires and very good for disease, but they are neither good for ecosystems nor for timber stands. So they have to be thinned, and that thinning can be done, in Oregon alone, on nearly 2 million acres already approved through the environmental process. The challenge is to get more funds into that effort.

That, too, should be part of this because, whether you talk to an environmentalist or talk to somebody who wants sawlogs for the mills, they both know that if you thin these forests, you make them more resistant to fire. With better timber stands, you have better ecosystems, and you supply a steady supply of sawlogs to the mill.

Let's not reopen the timber wars of the past. Let's work together with a win-win.

I want to show this chart because it indicates the dramatic change of what has happened to the Forest Service budget. We can go back to 1995 and compare it to the year 2015. I want to focus particularly on the orange. The orange is the amount of money that was spent fighting forest fires, and 20 years ago, it was 16 percent of the Forest Service budget. But in 2015—2 years ago—it broke 50 percent. It was 52 percent of their budget. This year, it has certainly gone up much higher than that. So as the amount of funds spent on fighting fires has increased, it has dramatically reduced the amount of funds that support our maintenance and improvement of the forest. That is what is getting squeezed out.

Let me put it differently. The more you spend fighting fires out of a single pot of money, the less money you have to prevent the fires. Everywhere I go they say: Can't we do more on the front end so these forests are more resilient? If you think about how fire works, it really gets going if the trees are close together because one tree lights the next tree on fire. If you thin them, you slow that down. The fire goes from the ground, where there is brush, to the canopy, where there are branches, very easily if the branches are close to the ground. So you trim off those branches, separate the trees, thin them out, shave off the branches, cut off the branches, and suddenly you have a forest that is much more resilient.

There are those folks who have said: Let's just get rid of the environmental rules. Let's just clearcut everything. Let's do 10,000 acres at a time. That is, by the way, 15 square miles. Let's set those 15 square miles next to each other. Let's just shave the Earth and wipe out the forests. That way, there will not be forest fires. Those are the timber wars of the past.

What we have seen is that we can bridge the divide between a good ecosystem and a good timber stand by thinning the forest, by making them more like a natural forest, which is much more fire resilient. In the process of thinning, which has to be done periodically over time, we are also providing a steady foundation for sawlogs for our mills.

There is a mill in John Day, OR. I met with the folks there who were very worried. The workers there were very worried about that mill getting shut down. I was determined to do everything I could to save that mill. What ended up happening is that we found we couldn't save that mill with a timber sale because a timber sale can't commit to a load of logs over a 10-year period. The owner of the mill couldn't commit to the cost of new machinery if he didn't know he would get logs for an extended period of time. So we discovered that we could, though, through a forest health contract—through a stewardship contract—enable a steady supply of thinned logs to make it to that mill and make sure that mill stayed open. Not only did it keep it open, but it added workers to that mill. That is the type of win-win solution that we need.

There is another way of looking at the cost of fighting fires. Here we see, in 1995, 16 percent of the budget going to fight fires; in 2017, 56 percent. Let's look into the future. An original estimate was that we would reach 67 percent by 2025; now the new estimate, based on the changing dynamics in the forest, is that we will get to over two-thirds of the budget fighting fires by the year 2021—four fire seasons from today. That is how big the issue is. That is why we need funds from the front end to be able to thin these forests. This is simply common sense.

If you are the private owner of a private forest, you wouldn't dare let this forest retain this high propensity for fires and disease. You would thin the forest. You would make it a better timber stand; you would make it a better ecosystem. And that is what we need to do.

We have also seen that another way of looking at the changes is how the staffing levels have changed over the last two decades. If we look at just two decades ago, we can see that in 1998 there were about 18,000 individuals dedicated to managing the forest lands and just 5,700 dedicated to going out and fighting blazes. Now we have come into the future, and we see now that the number of people fighting fires is larger than the number working on all of the other forest programs. We have to commit to doing far more on the prevention end. If we let this summer's crisis go without securing funding to thin those forests that have already gone through the environmental process, we are making a huge mistake, and it is going to cost us more because there are going to be even more fires in the future. So not only do we spend

more out of the National Treasury to fight them, but we will have less healthy timber stands to fuel our economy.

Let's end the fire burn. Let's provide the funding to restore the fire service assets that were burned, the scoured assets. Let's provide assistance through community development block grants and small business loans to assist the communities that were scoured by these fires. Let's pass Senator WYDEN and Senator CRAPO's bill, which proceeds to create a FEMA-like structure to back up the worst fire seasons, and certainly, certainly, absolutely, let's invest in prevention on the front end by thinning these forests and getting the flammable buildup of forest branches off the floor of the forests. Those are positive things we can do.

At this moment in Houston, in Miami, in Puerto Rico, people are thinking, what can we do to better prepare for the next storm surge? What can we do to be better prepared for the next hurricane? Well, we know for sure that we are going to have fires across the Northwest in Montana, in Idaho, in Oregon, in Washington every summer, and they are simply getting worse. We must ask ourselves the same question: How do we change this rhythm? How do we operate this differently and better? That is our responsibility in this Chamber, and that is the set of things we can do to have a far better outcome in the future.

I urge all of my colleagues to support these five efforts as we support funding for Texas and Florida and Puerto Rico. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Tuesday, October 17, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 191, the nomination of David Trachtenberg to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense. I further ask that there be 10 minutes of debate on the nomination equally divided in the usual form; that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 327, 332, 333, and 337.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Stephen B. King, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czech Republic; BARBARA LEE, of California, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Seventy-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; CHRISTOPHER SMITH, of New Jersey, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Seventy-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and J. Steven Dowd, of Florida, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

Is there any further debate on the nominations en bloc?

If not, the question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the King, Lee, Smith, and Dowd nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 365, 366, and 367.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Timothy Gallaudet, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere; Howard R. Elliott, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. Department of Transportation and Walter G. Copan, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gallaudet, Elliott, and Copan nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 360.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bruce J. Walker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability).

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Walker nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, over 2 weeks ago, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands were devastated by Hurricane Maria. This was less than a month after the islands felt the impacts of another powerful storm, Hurricane Irma. Hurricane Maria has left a wake of destruction across the islands. In Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, too many Americans remain without power, clean drinking water, or a method of communicating with their relatives and first responders.

Last week, I met with leaders in the Puerto Rican community in Chicago to discuss local efforts to provide aid.

This week, I met with a delegation from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to discuss relief efforts and what we can do at the Federal level to help them rebuild. The stories they shared about friends and family in Puerto Rico were heartbreaking. These people, our fellow American citizens, are facing a life and death situation. Sadly, the lives of at least 16 people have been claimed.

The situation in Puerto Rico is dire, and aid cannot wait. The 3.5 million people who live on the island of Puerto Rico are our fellow U.S. citizens, and it is our duty to provide aid to them in their time of need.

Yesterday, Congress received a supplemental aid request from the administration to provide much needed disaster relief to our fellow Americans. Now, Congress must come together to help these Americans rebuild homes and businesses, restore critical infrastructure, and access life-sustaining supplies.

Providing emergency disaster assistance to people in need is not a local issue. It is an American issue.

Just as I expect my colleagues to come to the aid of the State of Illinois when we are faced with a natural disaster and just as Congress came to the aid of Hurricane Harvey victims a few short weeks ago, the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands expect us to rally behind them as they work to respond to Hurricane Maria.

I urge my colleagues to quickly pass a clean aid package that will help all Americans whose lives have been impacted by these natural disasters. Any supplemental appropriations bill that includes aid for States impacted by Hurricanes Harvey and Irma must also include aid for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and western States that have been devastated by wildfires.

I was heartened to hear that the Illinois National Guard has deployed teams to provide telecommunication assistance, food, water, tents, and cots to Puerto Rico. I was also glad to see that individual assistance is now available for all 78 of the municipalities on the island, ensuring all individuals in Puerto Rico can receive assistance from the Federal Government.

The Federal response to this disaster has taken far too long, and we must do more to help our fellow American citizens during this humanitarian crisis.

In Congress, our top priority should be making sure the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have the funding they need to rebuild and recover. We cannot delay providing this much needed funding any longer.

It has been tragic to see thousands of shipping containers held at ports, which have been full of critical, life-sustaining supplies that are not reaching those most in need. There continue to be reports of families in Puerto Rico who are stranded and isolated. We must prioritize quickly distributing supplies to reach every individual in the days, weeks, and months to come.

The U.S. citizens who live in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are at risk of running out of food, water, and fuel. It would be unconscionable for us to abandon them in their time of need.

Our thoughts are with the many people who have lost their loved ones, their homes, and other property. I want to recognize the hard work of the volunteers, local officials, and Federal employees that have come forward in this time of need and pitched in at every level.

We can and should do more to help the people of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands rebuild and recover. I have no doubt that the people of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands will be able to clean up and rebuild, and they will be stronger for it. The entire Nation must come together as an American family to give them the aid and support they need at every step along the way.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are a lot of issues roiling our Nation these days. I want to talk about an issue that may not get all the headlines, but that has seen dramatic and troubling changes this year: our Nation's higher education policy.

Over the last several weeks, Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos has continued her assault on students and their families.

Previously we had seen her rescind reforms that would improve customer service for students and hold student loan servicers accountable for their treatment of borrowers; rescind a policy prohibiting debt collectors from charging borrowers 16 percent fees to bring their loans out of default; halt the processing of borrower defense loan discharge applications from students defrauded by for-profit colleges and throwing out rules intended to help students get the discharges to which they are entitled to under law; rewrite the gainful employment rule, which is meant to protect students from programs for-profit colleges that saddle students with too much debt compared to their income; propose eliminating public service loan forgiveness, which helps students afford to serve their communities, States, and country while repaying their student loans; propose dumping \$38 billion in additional student loan interest on needy students by eliminating subsidized undergraduate loans; and propose freezing the maximum Pell grant award so that their award covers even less of what it costs a student to attend college.

That is just the beginning.

Several weeks ago, I joined Senators BROWN, MURRAY, and WARREN in calling on Secretary DeVos to appoint a credible, well-qualified, independent chief enforcement officer to lead the Department of Education's enforcement unit.

The unit was created after the collapse of Corinthian to improve oversight of higher education institutions and enforcement of Federal laws.

Robert Kaye, a respected investigator and consumer expert from the Federal Trade Commission, was selected to be the first chief. Kaye left the post in March.

Secretary DeVos allowed this critical position to remain vacant for more than 4 months until earlier last month, when she finally announced the appointment of Dr. Julian Schmoke, Jr.

At first glance, Dr. Schmoke meets none of the requirements for the job that my colleagues and I set out in our letter.

As chief enforcement officer, Dr. Schmoke will be charged with ensuring that institutions of higher education are following Federal laws and regulations.

This will mean paying special attention to an area that poses the most risk to students and has demonstrated systemic abuse: for-profit colleges.

These are the colleges that enroll 9 percent of all postsecondary students in America, but take in 17 percent of all Federal student aid and account for 33 percent of all Federal student loan defaults.

Beyond the infamous Corinthian and ITT Tech examples, there are countless examples of for-profit colleges defrauding students, whether it be Ashford, Westwood, or DeVry.

Last year, DeVry agreed to pay the Federal Trade Commission \$100 million for defrauding students and agreed to a separate settlement with the Department of Education.

Guess who Dr. Schmoke previously worked for? You guessed it, DeVry University.

In fact, there are reports that DeVry is still under investigation by the very unit Dr. Schmoke has been appointed to lead. How is that for the fox guarding the henhouse?

If that wasn't enough, there is no discernable evidence on Dr. Schmoke's resume of any experience conducting or overseeing investigations.

Shortly after his appointment, I joined Senators BROWN, WARREN, BLUMENTHAL, and WHITEHOUSE in writing to Dr. Schmoke raising these concerns and asking him to meet with us. We are still waiting.

As Betsy DeVos orchestrates a corporate takeover of the Department of Education by for-profit interests, State attorneys general and other Federal agencies are even more important in providing aggressive oversight to protect students and taxpayers.

Betsy DeVos is doing what she can to disrupt that, too.

On September 1, the Department of Education provided notice to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that it was terminating its existing data-sharing agreement with the CFPB.

The Department took exception "to the CFPB unilaterally expanding its

oversight role . . ." into areas that the Department viewed as within its jurisdiction.

The CFPB has been a leader in protecting student borrowers harmed by Federal loan servicers like Navient and predatory lending practices by institutions like Corinthian and ITT Tech.

This political stunt makes clear that Secretary DeVos would rather initiate a turf war than work with other Federal agencies to fulfill the Federal Government's collective oversight responsibilities.

In announcing Dr. Schmoke as the new chief enforcement officer, Secretary DeVos said, "Protecting students has always been my top priority."

Well, Madam Secretary, your actions just don't back up that statement.

Nearly every time you have had the opportunity to stand up for students, their families, and taxpayers, you have turned your back on them.

Commonsense protections for students and taxpayers shouldn't be a partisan issue.

Secretary DeVos, I urge you to abandon this assault on students and instead work with us to strengthen America's system of higher education, to deal honestly with wrongdoing by for-profit colleges, and to increase opportunities for all Americans.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for today's vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 226, Callista L. Gingrich to be U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See. I would have voted yea. •

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CONFIRMATION OF ERIC HARGAN

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I had expected to be able to vote on the confirmation of Mr. Eric Hargan, to be Deputy Secretary for Health and Human Service, HHS. Instead, I am in Las Vegas to grieve with and assist my fellow Nevadans in the aftermath of the worst mass shooting in modern American history.

On the question of Mr. Hargan's nomination, I want to make my opposition to his confirmation clear. I do not believe Mr. Hargan to be qualified to be a leading member of HHS. This decision is based on his prior experience, his work and statements opposing the Affordable Care Act, as well as his statements regarding the extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program. Deputy Secretary Eric Hargan would be the highest ranking appointee at HHS, making him responsible for implementing and enforcing the Affordable Care Act, ACA, going forward. Considering the fact that the administration has repeatedly and consistently sought to undermine the ACA, I fear that someone with Mr. Hargan's views

will only aid and abet this reckless game the administration is playing with Americans' healthcare.

I hope that Mr. Hargan will surpass my expectations and serve this country well as Deputy Secretary at HHS. The role of HHS Deputy Secretary in implementing and administering the efforts of strengthening our healthcare system is too important for any other result. I believe strongly that Americans deserve affordable and accessible healthcare coverage, and I hope Mr. Hargan's actions as Deputy Director show that he agrees. However, I could not in good conscience vote to confirm someone about whom I have so many concerns. Thank you. •

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. 17-42, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Japan for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$113 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,
CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-42

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 Japan.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$108 million.
Other \$5 million.
Total \$113 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Fifty-six (56) AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs). Non-MDE includes: Containers, weapon support and support equipment, spare and repair parts, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (X7-D-YAK).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: JA-D-YAI, JA-D-YAH.

(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: October 4, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Japan—AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs)

The Government of Japan has requested a possible sale of fifty-six (56) AIM 120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs). Also included are containers, weapon support and support equipment, spare and repair parts, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$113 million.

This sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by meeting the security and defense needs of a major ally and partner nation. Japan continues to be an important force for peace, political stability, and economic progress in the Asia-Pacific region.

The proposed sale will provide Japan a critical air defense capability to assist in defending the Japanese homeland and U.S. personnel stationed there. Japan will have no difficulty absorbing these additional munitions into the Japan Air Self-Defense Force.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, Arizona. There are no offset arrangements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Japan.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-42

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 proposed sale will involve the release of sensitive technology to the Government of Japan related to the AIM-120C Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air (AMRAAM). The AIM-120C AMRAAM is a radar guided missile featuring digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include look-down/shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high flying, low flying, and maneuvering targets. The AMRAAM All Up Round is classified CONFIDENTIAL, major components and subsystems range from UNCLASSIFIED to CONFIDENTIAL, and technology data and other documentation are classified up to SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or an equivalent system which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that Japan can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Japan.

AUTOMATIC GUNFIRE PREVENTION ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced the Automatic Gunfire Prevention Act of 2017.

First, I would like to thank Senators BLUMENTHAL, MURPHY, SCHUMER, DURBIN, LEAHY, CORTEZ MASTO, VAN HOLLEN, GILLIBRAND, KLOBUCHAR, MARKEY, CASEY, REED, HASSAN, MERKLEY, CARPER, CARDIN, COONS, FRANKEN, HARRIS, BOOKER, WHITEHOUSE, HIRONO, SANDERS, WARREN, CANTWELL, MCCASKILL, NELSON, MURRAY, UDALL, KAINE, WARNER, BENNET, SCHATZ, WYDEN, BROWN, DUCKWORTH, MENENDEZ, and BALDWIN for cosponsoring this legislation. Their support for this bill is deeply appreciated.

Just days ago, in Las Vegas, NV, we experienced the worst mass shooting—in terms of the number of victims—in our Nation's history.

There are now at least 58 dead and nearly 500 wounded as a result of that attack. The grief and pain of so many victims and their loved ones is overwhelming and all too familiar to gun violence victims and survivors all across America.

What makes this mass shooting particularly devastating is that the shooting was done by a single gunman. Within minutes, the gunman exacted devastating firepower on hundreds of people, terrorizing concertgoers and an entire community.

How was this possible?

While facts are still being uncovered, we know that this particular gunman had amassed a vast arsenal. He had at least 23 firearms and hundreds of rounds of ammunition in his hotel room among which were 12 semiautomatic rifles enhanced with “bump-stock” devices.

These bump-stock devices are typically used to turn semiautomatic rifles into functional machine guns, capable of shooting hundreds of bullets per minute.

A semiautomatic rifle's rate of fire is usually 45 to 60 rounds per minute. With a bump-stock device attached, these semiautomatic weapons can fire up to 700 rounds per minute. Bump-stock devices are readily accessible. They can be purchased online or at a store by anyone for merely \$100.

Anyone who has seen YouTube video clips of semiautomatic rifles outfitted with these devices knows just how devastating they are.

The number of bullets that can be sprayed into a crowd within minutes is staggering.

Because they are so dangerous, automatic machine-gun-like weapons have been categorically banned in America since 1986 under the National Firearms Act.

This law was a direct response to the Prohibition Era's mobster crimes during which machine guns were used to kill their victims at a deadly rate.

One seminal event during this period was the St. Valentine's Day Massacre of 1929.

That tragic day was marked by the murder of seven men in a garage on the North Side of Chicago. The massacre was the culmination of a feud between an Irish American gang and another gang led by Al Capone. Organized crime was rampant during that era, and fully automatic weapons were the weapons of choice for gangsters. Indeed, the men who committed the St. Valentine's Day Massacre used Thompson submachine guns, known as “Tommy guns,” to mow down their victims.

The St. Valentine's Day Massacre, which remains in infamy, clearly demonstrated that elected leaders must do something about this violence and get these fully automatic guns out of the hands of killers.

As a result, the National Firearms Act was enacted in 1934. When originally passed, it heavily regulated machine guns, imposing a tax on the making and transferring of machine guns and other lethal weapons. It also imposed a special occupational tax on those engaged in the business of importing, manufacturing, and dealing in firearms regulated under the National Firearms Act.

It also required the registration of all machine guns and other guns regulated under the National Firearms Act with the Treasury Secretary.

Later, in 1986, the National Firearms Act was amended to ban all future automatic weapons from private possession, except for those legally owned and registered as of May 19, 1986.

Therefore, today, automatic weapons are generally banned for civilian use—and rightfully so. They are absolutely lethal weapons of war and have no business being in our homes, our schools, our businesses, and our streets.

Notwithstanding this outright ban, there is a loophole in the law that allows bump-stock devices to configure legal semiautomatic weapons so that they can function like a fully automatic weapon. This loophole must be closed.

If automatic weapons are banned, these devices should be banned. There is no functional difference between automatic weapons and a bump-stock enhanced semiautomatic weapon. Such devices are simply not needed to hunt

or to use in a private home for self-defense.

Like we saw in Las Vegas, these bump-stock devices allow those with a motive to kill to use fully legal firearms to wreak havoc and kill large numbers of people within minutes.

The bill I have introduced is straightforward. It closes the loophole that allows civilians to purchase and use devices that convert semiautomatic weapons into machine guns. Specifically, it bans the sale, transfer, importation, manufacturing, or possession of bump fire devices, trigger cranks, or anything that accelerates a semiautomatic rifle's rate of fire.

The bill further provides an exception to this ban, by allowing for the lawful possession of these devices by law enforcement and the government.

Those who violate the ban would be subject to the same penalty available to those who illegally possess a machine gun under current law.

Closing this loophole should not be a partisan issue. Anyone who has seen footage from the shooting in Las Vegas should recognize that weapons that are altered to emulate automatic gunfire should not be permitted in our communities.

In my view, this bill is a modest proposal. It was one that was included in the Assault Weapons Ban legislation that I proposed 4 years ago, which we failed to pass in 2013.

Tragically, had that legislation been enacted in 2013, it could have perhaps saved lives in Las Vegas.

Indeed, when the police dispatcher was first contacted in Las Vegas at 10:09 PM local time, it took 11 minutes until the last shots were fired and the suspect was neutralized.

Think of that for a moment. If automatic gunfire had been impossible for the gunman, less shots would have sprayed through Las Vegas that night, and less people may have died. That is extraordinarily sobering.

I recall standing here on this floor nearly 4 years ago, urging my colleagues to adopt the assault weapons ban, pleading that it could possibly save lives.

That was on the heels of one of the darkest days in American history, when 20 beautiful children and 6 educators had their lives taken at Sandy Hook Elementary School. It is an absolute travesty that Congress refused to act back then.

It is my strongest belief that when our Nation is faced with dire situations—like sickness, or job stagnation, or human trafficking—it is our job, our solemn oath as lawmakers, to try to solve these problems.

We utterly forsake that solemn oath when we simply do nothing; when we yield to cynicism or to a single lobbying faction.

If we do not act today, we are failing the American people. We are failing our communities. We are failing responsible gun owners.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. We must act. Now is the time.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, the United States is facing an urgent nuclear crisis with North Korea. President Trump should not trigger another nuclear crisis with Iran.

North Korea's nuclear program presents a clear and direct threat to the United States. Our top military official, General Dunford, testified last month that North Korea has the capability to strike the U.S. mainland with an intercontinental ballistic missile. North Korea has ramped up the pace of its ballistic missile tests, firing two ICBMs over Japan in recent months. Just last month, North Korea conducted its sixth test of a nuclear weapon, the largest yet.

Meanwhile, President Trump and North Korean leader Kim Jong Un are engaged in nuclear brinkmanship. Trump has threatened to "totally destroy" North Korea, has tweeted that North Korea "might not be around much longer," and has rebuked his own Secretary of State for attempting to find a diplomatic solution. With each reckless pronouncement, Trump's threats could bring the United States closer to a war that would put at risk millions of lives, including tens of thousands of American soldiers.

Confronted with the North Korean nuclear threat, President Trump is seeking to provoke another nuclear crisis, this time in the turbulent Middle East. He has repeatedly threatened to withdraw from the agreement that the United States and the international community forged to prohibit Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. He has called the Iran deal an "embarrassment," "the worst deal ever," and has vowed to "rip up" the agreement. In making those threats, Trump is putting our security and credibility at risk.

The Iran deal is working. It has verifiably shut off Iran's pathways to a nuclear bomb, imposed tough constraints on Iran's nuclear program, and subjected Iran to the most comprehensive inspection and monitoring regime ever negotiated. How do we know? We know from Donald Trump himself.

Just 2 weeks ago, President Trump found Iran in compliance and waived nuclear-related sanctions on Iran. In fact, the Trump administration has twice certified Iran's compliance with the deal, acknowledging that adherence to the agreement is in the vital national security interests of the United States. Our State Department, our Defense Department, and our intelligence community have all assessed that Iran is in compliance with the nuclear agreement. Most importantly, President Trump has presented no evidence to Congress, as he is required to do by law, of any potential Iranian breach of the deal. In fact, the administration has yet to brief the Senate on its strategy for Iran, despite weekly requests from my colleagues.

Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, Trump has suggested

that he will refuse to certify Iran's compliance with the deal by October 15, the next deadline. This will effectively kick the deal's fate to Congress, which will then have 60 days to decide whether to reimpose the nuclear-related sanctions on Iran waived under the deal.

Make no mistake: Trump's reasons for not certifying Iran's compliance are based on politics, not national security. He wants to tear up an agreement that has prevented Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, simply because it was negotiated by a democratic administration. Trump has threatened to do this without offering any alternative plan to block Iran from getting a nuclear bomb.

In the absence of any evidence of an Iranian violation, Trump and his team are manufacturing reasons not to certify the deal, citing issues not addressed in the nuclear agreement, such as Iran's sponsorship of regional terrorism, its ballistic missile tests, and its human rights violations.

Iran is subject to sanctions for those malign activities. Since the Iran deal has been implemented, the United States had designated over 100 individuals and entities for sanctions. Congress passed a new law this July, that I cosponsored, sanctioning Iran for these aggressions. It is worth underscoring this point: Donald Trump has yet to issue instructions to his administration on how to implement that sanctions law.

In short, the Iran deal has not prevented the United States from taking measures to hold Iran accountable for its destabilizing actions elsewhere. It has, however, prevented Iran from conducting those same actions with a nuclear weapon. That is where our focus should continue to be. A nuclear-armed Iran would be a far greater menace in the region than a nonnuclear Iran.

The truth is, if the United States had tried to expand the nuclear agreement to also address Iran's ballistic missile tests and its regional terrorism, there would simply be no deal. Russia and China would not have agreed to its terms. Preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon was the only point on which all parties were united. Critics of the deal who argue otherwise are not being straight with the American people.

In a world of alternative facts, that point is worth reiterating. No deal, including this one, contains everything we want. That is the nature of a negotiation. Unilaterally withdrawing from the agreement will not produce a better deal today. In fact, we have much less negotiating leverage today. The United States does not have the backing of our allies and partners around the world for withdrawal. Our partners have been crystal clear. They will not renegotiate the deal while it is working. Without that international backing, we have no leverage with Iran.

This brings to bear another, equally important, point. This administration

is already putting American credibility at risk; if we manufacture a specious excuse for abandoning the Iran agreement, our word will mean little. That will make it nearly impossible to negotiate a diplomatic solution to the nuclear crisis in North Korea, already an extremely challenging prospect. Put simply, our allies, partners, and adversaries would have no reason to trust the United States.

That is why Secretary of Defense Mattis, when asked whether it was in the national security interest of the United States to stay in the Iran deal, said, "Yes, Senator, I do."

I want to end by outlining the choice we face right now. The choice we face right now is between a deal or no deal. It is between cutting off Iran's pathways to a bomb or allowing Iran to push forward with its nuclear weapons program. It is between maintaining U.S. leadership in the world or empowering our adversaries. It is a choice between diplomacy or heading down a path toward war.

For these reasons, I urge President Trump to certify Iran's compliance with the nuclear agreement by October 15. If he fails to do so, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to preserve the deal.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues and all Americans in celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month and the innumerable contributions of the Hispanic American community. There is much to celebrate. Although Hispanic Americans comprise 18 percent of the U.S. population, Latino-owned businesses, by some estimates, are responsible for approximately 86 percent of this country's small business growth. What is more, their economic influence is unrivaled by any other demographic since the baby boomers, representing a \$1.5 trillion segment of the consumer market, according to a recent Stanford University state of Latino entrepreneurship, and perhaps, most notably, Hispanic Americans play an increasingly important role in our democracy, with a record 27 million Latinos eligible to vote in last year's election.

It has never been clearer that Hispanic Americans represent an impressive cultural and economic force. Ultimately, however, their value to this country is not in their statistics. It is in their character. A love for family, a commitment to community, and an unparalleled penchant for hard work are the tenets of Hispanic heritage. They are also the building blocks of America. This is no coincidence: Hispanic Americans helped build and sustain our Nation. They are an irreplaceable thread in the fabric of American society. With their knack for innovation, with their fearless pursuit of better lives, and sometimes with their bare hands, they have shaped this country from the ground up, and we are all the better for it.

While we use this month to reflect on their dignity and importance to this country, this year, in particular, the Hispanic American community is best served through actions not just words. Congress must pass the Dream Act. President Trump's order to rescind the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, Program has shaken the Hispanic American community and most American to their core. Dreamers were brought to this country as children, with no decision in the matter. More importantly, they are quintessentially American in every way, except for their immigration status. They have lived, played, worshipped, and gone to school alongside our children most of their lives. They are our children's classmates and neighborhood friends and teammates. They are the college students studying at the library. They are the young serviceworkers at our favorite restaurants, studiously saving up for next semester's tuition. They are young men and women in uniform, serving in harm's way, defending our freedoms.

Dreamers were raised here, and most know no other home except the United States of America. If Congress does not act to protect them, the President's actions will force many of them out of work, into hiding and into poverty. This will not make America stronger. What makes America stronger are the Dreamers themselves. Their spirit, character, and will to overcome represent what is best about our country. We should be proud to call them our own. We shouldn't be sending them underground or into exile.

There is another urgent matter demanding our full attention: hurricane relief for Puerto Rico. The pictures coming from Puerto Rico are heart-breaking. The devastation that has hit the island as a result of Hurricane Maria deserves the same commitment and support that would go to any other location in the United States. Puerto Rico's 3.4 million residents are American citizens, and they should be treated just the same as residents of Florida, Texas, and Louisiana. The Senate should quickly take up the emergency supplemental appropriations request as soon as possible after the Columbus Day recess.

Voting rights, access to quality, affordable healthcare, higher education, tax reform, these are also issues critically important to Hispanic Americans because they are the issues important to the country. There is no breathing room between the two. Our national interests are their personal interests, so their interests must also be ours.

Americans are a diverse group; we do not all look the same or worship in the same way. We are, each and every one of us, united by far more profound things: a love for the freedoms this country affords us; respect for the power and peace we derive from our diverse communities; and an unshakable belief in every person's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

What makes us Americans is our moral fiber and our shared love for the United States. Any other litmus test is a discriminatory one; yet every day, and sometimes at the hands of our own government, Hispanic Americans are tested and questioned, profiled, and met with suspicion, out of sheer ignorance and baseless prejudice. Still, they march on. They meet the challenges of systemic discrimination with grace, grit, and courage. Indeed, the Hispanic American community often reflects the best of America, even when America offers less than its best in return.

Now more than ever, Hispanic Heritage Month must be about standing up and declaring support for Hispanic Americans. Now more than ever, Congress must use its collective voice to magnify their voices, to affirm Hispanic Americans' rightful place in this Nation and to proclaim a commitment to representing their interests right here in this Chamber.

We must begin fulfilling that commitment by immediately passing the Dream Act. But our commitment must extend further. We must support more equal representation of Hispanic Americans in our society, including in Congress. We must address the healthcare disparities that disproportionately affect the Hispanic community, an issue that begs Congress to work together toward more universal, affordable coverage. We must acknowledge the difficulties Hispanic American students face in affording college. Finally, we must stand firm against the tidal wave of bigoted rhetoric that has flooded the national dialogue in recent months. Whenever and wherever Hispanic Americans are degraded, belittled, or oppressed, basic morality demands that we speak up and speak out. Tolerance and respect, like a muscle, require effort and exercise. We must not allow these values to atrophy on our watch. Diversity and inclusion are American virtues and proud features of Hispanic heritage alike; we must now, and always, be their steward.

TRIBUTE TO MARY GAUTREAUX

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I wish to indulge in a bit of bragging. I know every one of us in this Chamber has that one or two staffers who are the Jacks or Janes of all trades of their operations.

My longtime loyal friend and staffer, who has served the great State of Oregon for over 20 years in my office as a fellow, a field representative, and now deputy State director, Mary Gautreaux celebrates her 70th birthday on October 17. I want to recognize her enormous and long-lasting contributions over the past two decades in my office to making Oregon a better place to live and enjoy.

Mary brings a lifetime of expertise to the natural resources issues that play such an essential part in Oregon's economy and quality of life. Not only

does she know these issues but she has lived these issues and passed on her love of them to her children, Ryder, Myria, Callie, and Lucas, as well as her five grandchildren.

Before joining my office in the 1990s, Mary served in the U.S. Forest Service. In those days, Mary planted trees and fought fires to support her young family. While the work was seasonal, to start, she quickly made an impression on the U.S. Forest Service and became a full-time employee.

Then I was lucky enough to get her as a fellow in 1994 in my DC office when I was still a member of the House of Representatives for the proud 3rd District of Oregon and still had rugged good looks and a full head of hair.

She worked in my DC office for a year and had just moved back to Oregon when I realized my office was better for her presence, so I hired Mary to work as field rep in Oregon. I may not know much about a lot of things, but I can recognize an excellent teammate, and Mary was a natural fit on "Team Wyden."

When I was elected to the U.S. Senate for the first time in 1996, I made a promise to do a townhall meeting in every county in Oregon every year I was privileged enough to represent the good people of Oregon in Washington, DC. In the last 21 years, she has been with me at almost every one of the 800-plus townhalls I have held each year in each of Oregon's 36 counties.

At almost every one of those townhalls, I have at some junction pointed to Mary and said, "Folks, give Mary a call about this issue. She works nights and weekends—never hesitate to call." It does not matter the issue; Mary always answers the phone. She has been going the extra mile with and for Oregonians in every nook and cranny of our State, both literally and figuratively.

Literally, Mary has traveled with me and solo to countless meetings in grange halls, diners, and farmhouses all across Oregon, and there has never been an issue too big or too small for her to take on.

One way to explain the praise Mary has earned is to say that Oregonians know Mary as a public servant always willing to listen and find solutions that benefit all of Oregon and Oregonians, not just the ones that vote for me. She lives by my promise to be the "Senator for all of Oregon," and Oregonians know it and appreciate her for it.

My appreciation and Oregon's appreciation for Mary goes deeper than that accurate and well-deserved summation.

The deeper truth is that anybody who knows Mary knows she is an original and unforgettable force of nature—fierce on behalf of Oregonians, bold in her problem-solving, always willing to help, and just as ready with a smile to lighten any situation.

She has a gigantic heart matched only by her passion for public service and protecting the natural treasures we Oregonians all hold dear.

The bottom line is I have been very fortunate to work with her, to call her friend, to have her as an integral member of Team Wyden, and I look forward to many more years of her public service to the people of Oregon and her friendship to me and my family.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DONALD AND RITA GALLES

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the St. Anthony Tri-Parish Catholic School Foundation's 2017 honorees, Donald Galles and Rita (Murphy) Galles.

The foundation supports the wonderful work of the St. Anthony Tri-Parish Catholic School. The school is dedicated to achieving academic excellence in a faith-filled community and living a life committed to Christian service. Since 1927, the school and staff have provided a high standard of academic achievement and Christian values. The school provides strong religious and educational leadership to the Casper community.

On October 12, 2017, the foundation will be hosting the sixth annual Joy Breakfast and celebrating the school's 90th anniversary, nearly a century of educating students. Every year at this event, the foundation honors individuals who have made outstanding contributions to the school and exemplify the values of the Catholic community. Don Galles and Rita (Murphy) Galles are perfect for this honor. Both the Galles family and the Murphy family have a long history of supporting Catholic education and serving as role models to our community. John and Mari Ann Martin, Susie and the late Mick McMurry, and Joe Scott will also be recognized at the breakfast for their invaluable contribution and dedication to the St. Anthony's Tri-Parish Catholic School Foundation.

Rita is a caring nurse and dedicated mother. As a native to Casper, WY, she attended St. Anthony's Parochial School and graduated from Natrona County High School in 1947. Rita then attended the St. Joseph's School of Nursing in Denver, CO, and started her nursing career. As a nurse, she touched so many lives by caring for the sick and injured. While in Denver, she married Dr. Joseph Murphy at the Blessed Sacrament Church on November 24, 1953. They were married for 51 years and had 12 children: Patrick, Mary Ann, Donald, Kevin, Mark, Sheila, Michelle, Rita, Kathleen, Maureen, Robert, and Anne. Rita enrolled all 12 of her children in St. Anthony's in order to ensure they received an excellent academic and religious foundation. With this strong background, her children have collectively spent more than 75 years in post-high school education.

Donald is a decorated veteran, accomplished businessman, and loving

family man. Like Rita, he is a native of Casper, WY, and attended both St. Anthony's Parochial School and Natrona County High School. After high school, Don joined the U.S. Army's 100th Infantry Division in France. He proudly fought for our country on the front lines during World War II. Don was seriously wounded while fighting in France. For his brave service to our Nation, Don was awarded the Silver Star, the Nation's third-highest award for valor. He also received a Bronze Star, Purple Heart, and Combat Infantry Badge. After the war, Don attended and graduated from Creighton University in Nebraska. It is there that he met Ann Christensen, who later became his wife for 55 years. They returned to Casper and raised six children: Tom, David, Dona, Laura, Karla, and Jeff. Many of their children attended St. Anthony's. In Casper, Don had a successful career as a partner with a local oil and gas firm. He is also active in the community as a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Knights of Columbus, and a lifelong member of St. Anthony's Catholic Church.

The Galles and Murphy families were joined together in 2005. In the presence of their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, Don and Rita were married at St. Anthony's Catholic Church on December 29, 2005. As the place where they first met as children, the church holds great memories and a deep personal connection for them both.

Over the years, Don and Rita have generously contributed their time and resources to both the church and school. They have also given back to our community in numerous other ways. For example, Don and Rita made an essential donation to purchase land and a building to expand the Casper Seton House, which assists homeless mothers and children. Their kindness, devotion, and generosity are true reflections of their character and the values they have passed along to their family.

It is with great honor that I recognize these outstanding members of our Wyoming community. My wife, Bobbi, joins me in extending our congratulations to Donald and Rita Galles for receiving this special award.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN GABRIEL "GABE" SMITH

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a Marylander, John Gabriel Smith, whose courage not only broke barriers for himself but also advanced the cause of the betterment of humanity. We celebrate and honor Mr. Smith, known as Gabe, because he was the very first African American to graduate from Gonzaga College Preparatory High School, located just a few blocks from the Capitol Building, with the class of 1954.

Gabe was born in the turbulent times of the early 1940s in St. Mary's County,

MD, where he and his two sisters were introduced to the ugly world of racism. His hard-working parents committed their children to a Catholic education and religious fellowship at St. Peter Claver, a predominantly African-American church in rural Ridge, MD. As an eighth grader, Gabe decided to serve as an altar boy; little did he know that it would change his life and place him in the annals of American history.

The head pastor of St. Peter Claver was a humble man by the name of Father Horace B. McKenna, S.J., a White Jesuit priest who had been serving the segregated and neglected African-American community in Southern Maryland for two decades. Father McKenna would later found So Others Might Eat, SOME, a ministry which continues to feed the hungry here in Washington, DC. One day, Gabe listened intently as Father McKenna described the spiritual journey many men had taken on the way to priesthood. Gabe, who was interested in pursuing this vocation, asked Father McKenna how he could become a priest too. Father McKenna told Gabe that he would, at a minimum, need to learn Latin. Unfortunately, there were no schools in St. Mary's County or the surrounding areas that Gabe could attend which taught Latin, let alone provide the other instruction necessary to launch his vocation, so Father McKenna told him about a school in Washington, DC, where he could learn Latin and all the other requisites. That school was Gonzaga College High School.

Racial segregation was the barrier that would have prevented Gabe from attending Gonzaga, but that was about to change. Gabe often speaks about the angels who have been in his life, including Father McKenna, football coach Joe Kozik, and Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, a man who quietly but diligently worked to break the racial divide here in the Nation's Capital. Several years before the Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954 to end segregation, Archbishop O'Boyle ordered the integration of all Catholic schools and churches in the Archdiocese of Washington. Thus, in 1951, John Gabriel Smith was one of the first African Americans to enter Gonzaga, one of the Nation's elite prep schools.

Gabe moved in with his sister, who lived around the corner from the school. He had observed and experienced abusive conditions under segregation in St. Mary's County; thus, he was on guard among his peers at school. Fortunately, during his time at Gonzaga, his classmates welcomed him in the classroom and stood with him in the face of adversity and strife when they walked outside the school's walls.

As a member of the Gonzaga Purple Eagle football team, he encountered yet another angel in his life, a football coach named Joe Kozik, who stood by Gabe, along with his teammates. Whenever the Eagles played an opponent opposed to integrated teams, Coach Kozik and his teammates always stuck to-

gether like a family to overcome hate and ignorance.

In June of 1954, the year of the Brown decision to end segregation in public schools across the Nation, Gabe completed his education at Gonzaga College High School as the first African-American graduate. Poised with a thorough education, including a command of Latin, he entered Howard University, where he chose to pursue a different vocation and graduated with a degree in pharmacy. He became a pharmacist and worked for over 40 years, retiring just this past spring with Shopper's Food Warehouse in Fort Washington, MD, where he spent most of his career.

Gabe has been married to Mrs. Jeanette Graves Smith for 50 years and has five children; his eldest, Pamela, passed away several years ago. Gabe is a proud Marylander and a proud resident of Prince George's County. He has long led his neighborhood association as president and served as an active member in good standing of the Mt. Ennon Baptist Church Men's Ministry.

Even though more than 60 years have passed since Gabe attended Gonzaga, he still comments, "I had angels who helped me through and they continue to be with me today." To this day, Gabe sees his life as an example of the power of love in the pursuit of the greater good. Gabe's life shows us that, despite dark times and dark moments, where there is light through our good deeds and good intentions, there is hope.

John Gabriel Smith was the first of over 1,100 African-American students to graduate from Gonzaga College High School so far. He will leave an outstanding legacy for the State of Maryland, the halls of Gonzaga, and for the United States as an example of what happens when we seek inclusion and love for humanity. He shows us that living by faith and love, everyone can succeed. I commend Gabe Smith for his leadership and life of service.●

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a Marylander, John Gabriel "Gabe" Smith, whose courage not only broke barriers for himself but whose courage advanced the cause of the betterment of humanity.

On October 14, he will be recognized at the Gonzaga High School homecoming by the Gonzaga Onyx, a group of African-American alumni of Gonzaga, due to his achievement of being the very first African-American to graduate from Washington, DC's Gonzaga College Preparatory High School with the class of 1954.

He was born in the turbulent times of the early 40s in St. Mary's County, MD, where he and his two sisters grew up. His parents relied on hard work and diligence to pursue excellence and committed their children to a Catholic education and religious fellowship at St. Peter Claver, a church with a predominantly African-American parish in rural Ridge, MD. As an eighth grad-

er, Gabe decided to serve as an altar boy; little did he know, it would change his life and place him in the annals of American history.

He listened to Father McKenna describe the ways that people had traveled to find God and become a priest. Interested in pursuing this vocation, he asked Father McKenna how he, too, could achieve it and was surprised when Father McKenna told him that he would, at a minimum, need to know Latin.

Unfortunately, there were no schools in St. Mary's or the surrounding areas that taught Latin, let alone the tools necessary to launch his vocation, so Father McKenna told him about a school in Washington, DC, where he could learn Latin and all the other requisites. That school was Gonzaga College High.

Several years before the Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954 to end segregation, Archbishop O'Boyle ordered the integration of all Catholic schools and churches in the Archdiocese of Washington. Thus, in 1951, he entered the halls of Gonzaga.

Fortunately, during his time at Gonzaga, his classmates stood with him in the face of adversity and strife when they walked outside the school walls. As a member of the Gonzaga Purple Eagle football team, he encountered additional support from Coach Joe Kozik who stood by him, along with his teammates. Whenever the Eagles would play an opponent that vehemently rejected the idea of teams with African-American players, Coach Kozik and his teammates always stuck together like a family to overcome hate and ignorance.

In 1954, he completed his education at Gonzaga College High School as the first African-American graduate. Poised with his education and command of Latin, he entered Howard University and graduated with a degree in pharmacy, where he commanded his field for over 40 years, just retiring this past spring of 2017. He is now spending time with his wife and children.

Gabe says that "he had angels who helped him through and they continue to be with him today." He will forever leave an outstanding legacy for the State of Maryland and the halls of Gonzaga College High School. He was the first African American at Gonzaga, paving the way for over 1,100 esteemed African-American alumni to follow in his footsteps.●

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT COLONEL FREDERICK HOLLISTER CAMPBELL AND AMY S. CAMPBELL

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to honor the lives of Lt. Col. Frederick Hollister Campbell and Amy S. Campbell.

Lt. Col Frederick Hollister Campbell served in the U.S. Marine Corps for more than 25 years, serving in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. He earned

a Navy Commendation Medal for saving the lives of 250 fellow marines at the Battle of Iwo Jima. After his military career, Fred opened his own private law practice and taught college-level classes at Colorado College and the University of Colorado.

During a time when women rarely attended college, Amy received her B.A. in elementary education from National University and went on to receive her M.A. in reading education from Northwestern University. Prior to her marriage to Fred, Amy taught first and second grade. A two-time military widow, Amy lost her first husband, Bob Noran, as a result of injuries sustained during the Battle of the Bulge in WWII.

Amy and Fred were married on April 14, 1951. A proud supporter of her husband's career, Amy put aside her teaching career to be a full-time officer's wife and mother to their daughter.

Amy and Fred went on to live an incredible life together, traveling, raising their daughter, Susan, and volunteering with many organizations. Fred passed away on December 27, 2011, and Amy went on to live near Susan in Missoula, MT, before passing away on November 29, 2016. I send my condolences to the friends and family of Fred and Amy, as they are both greatly missed. They will be laid to rest together in Arlington National Cemetery.●

TRIBUTE TO BRADEN MATZINGER

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing a young Montanan named Braden Matzinger for his compassionate heart and entrepreneurial spirit in helping our State recover from a devastating wildfire season.

The 2017 wildfire season has impacted many communities in Montana. The fires consumed nearly 1.3 million acres of land. Over the summer, two firefighters lost their lives while protecting the people of the Treasure State. The bravery and commitment demonstrated by all the folks involved with the firefighting effort has generated a sense of unity and support from Troy to Alzada. That sense of unity can be found in the actions of 9-year-old Braden Matzinger of Bozeman. Braden has raised donations for the Montana Wildfire Relief Fund at the last two Montana State University home football games. He sweetened his approach to charitable fundraising with a cup of free lemonade for all those making a donation. At the two football games, he raised over \$600 in donations.

Sometimes life throws us lemons. How we respond is a reflection of our character. The Montana values of charity, compassion, and entrepreneurship are alive and well in the character of our next generation of youngsters, and Braden is a prime example. Thank you, Braden, for seeing an opportunity to help, making a plan, and following through with your plan. To Braden's parents, Jeff and Katie, thank you as

well for raising such a high-quality young man.●

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 164TH REGIMENT LANDING ON GUADALCANAL

● Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, 75 years ago, on October 13, 1942, the men of the 164th Infantry Regiment, North Dakota Army National Guard, landed on Guadalcanal to make history as the first U.S. Army unit to offensively engage the enemy in either theatre during World War II.

The soldiers, supplies, and the rifles they carried were welcomed by the beleaguered First Marine Division that had been fighting on the island since August. The prize was the strategic airfield captured by the marines and coveted by both Allies and the enemy as a key location to champion air and naval superiority in that area of the South Pacific.

On Guadalcanal for only 12 days, the trained but untested soldiers were thrust into the second battle for Henderson Field on the night of October 24. The 3rd Battalion trudged up muddy slopes to fight shoulder to shoulder with Lt. Col. Chesty Puller's marines as waves of Japanese threatened the thin line protecting the airfield. The next day, having proved its mettle, the 164th Infantry remained in charge of that line as the marines moved to an adjacent location. The Japanese attacked the 164th sector on the night of October 26, incorrectly believing the new Army troops could not hold the line. The 164th held firm at the location that became known as the Battle of Coffin Corner, earning the respect of the marines in the form of a Navy Presidential Unit Citation.

The lineage of the 164th Infantry Regiment carries significant history as North Dakota National Guard infantrymen were called to serve in the Spanish American War, the Philippine Insurrection, Mexican Border Incident, World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. The regiment ceased to exist in 1955, its companies reorganized to engineer units, but the esprit de corps of the combat soldiers has remained intact.

On the 75th anniversary, to the day, of the regiment's landing at Guadalcanal, the 164th Infantry Association will hold its last annual reunion, ending a tradition that began in 1945. On Saturday, October 14, the 164th Association will host a public event to recognize the service and heritage of the unit that was so important to the history of the North Dakota Army National Guard, the State of North Dakota, and the United States of America. Eight veterans of Guadalcanal will attend this event, ages 94 to 98, and they will represent all members of the regiment, living or remembered, as this important chapter of North Dakota military history ends.●

RECOGNIZING FIGARETTI'S RESTAURANT

● Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Figaretti's Restaurant in the scenic northern panhandle of my home State of West Virginia.

Figaretti's was recently named the best Italian restaurant in West Virginia. In my home State, this honor means so much more than just good food. It is a testament to our State's value of family, heritage, and traditions.

Some people may think our love of history means we cling to the past. It is the exact opposite. In an age where the future seems so uncertain, where we have access to more information and more choices than we know how to process, West Virginians know their priorities. What has stayed constant throughout history is our commitment to our loved ones, keeping our traditions alive, and passing our knowledge of our diverse heritage on to the next generation. The future of West Virginia and the entire country is at the forefront of our minds. These are the values that have made West Virginia stand out in our Nation, and these values are also present in the legacy of excellence at Figaretti's.

In 1944, Sicilian immigrant, Anna Figaretti, started making spaghetti sauce for her neighbors while her husband, Giuseppe, worked in the local mine in Clarksburg. Soon, with support and encouragement from her community and help from her five sons, Anna's spaghetti sauce became available in local grocery stores and eventually in her own restaurant.

Today the restaurant is owned by the third generation of the family. It is my honor to congratulate Dino Figaretti, his wife, Michelle, and his son, Enzo, for this special recognition. Gayle and I have enjoyed the company of the Figaretti family at the beloved Wheeling location and have shared many great meals and conversations with Tony, Sr., and Tony, Jr. I value their friendship so very much.

Owning a business is one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences, and doing it as a family makes it all the more special.

It is my honor to recognize and celebrate the Figaretti family and the Wheeling community for this well-deserved honor.●

REMEMBERING ERMALEE HICKEL

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Ermalee Hickel, the wife of our late Governor, Wally Hickel, who passed away on September 14 at the age of 92. Ermalee was married to Wally Hickel for 65 years until his death in 2010. She is buried next to her husband in Anchorage Memorial Park, standing up, facing Washington, just as Governor Hickel was.

This is the way the power couple of post-Statehood Alaska desired to be remembered. Standing up for Alaskans to

Washington, DC. A powerful symbol not only to Alaskans, but Washington, that the battle for Alaska's sovereignty is far from over and that the Hickels, in spirit, stand with Alaskans as we wage this battle to conclusion, however long that may take.

Wally and Ermalee's son, Jack Hickel, remembers these words explaining why his father wanted to be buried standing up. "He said, if they don't do it right he's going to crawl out of his grave and straighten them out. He thought they were going to screw everything up. He wanted to keep his eye on them." Now there will be two pair of eyes gazing east.

Ermalee, I should warn you, has two pretty tough eyes. She was widely known as "more beautiful than a butterfly, but tougher than a boot."

The history books will mention that Ermalee was twice the first lady of Alaska, as well as the wife of a Secretary of the Interior. They might mention that she was a strong woman, but that really doesn't tell you much about the person, and there is really much more to the story.

Ermalee was born to Lewis and Aline Strutz. The Strutzes moved from Montana to Anchorage in 1924. They bought a house downtown and raised six kids in that house: four girls and two boys. Anchorage was a pretty small town in the day, but it had plenty of life. As a high school student, Ermalee did it all. She was a softball player, editor of the school paper, and quite popular. She never missed a dance. She ushered at the movie theatre and, unique to Anchorage, worked at a cannery. Upon graduation, she went to work on the local base as the secretary to a military officer, a very important job for an outstanding individual. The Strutz girls were like that—popular, successful, from a really good family.

Wally Hickel, on the other hand, arrived in Anchorage from Kansas in 1940 with all of 37 cents in his pocket. His family was in insurance, but he left Kansas to pursue his passion in boxing. That led him to California, and when it didn't work out, Wally booked a ticket in steerage on a vessel headed to Alaska. He replenished his bank account by winning a \$125 purse at a boxing tournament conducted during Fur Rondy, the Anchorage winter carnival. Wally married a local girl, Jannice Cannon, who went to school with Ermalee. Wally and Jannice had a son, Ted. Jannice tragically died in 1943 at the Mayo Clinic. Wally returned to Anchorage, a single dad, and took a job inspecting aircraft on the ramp of Alaska airbases.

In 1945, Ermalee and Wally were married in a small Catholic Church and went on to build a family. It was a tough time for the both of them. Wally still had to pay off Jannice's medical bills and worked a second job as a bartender and a bouncer to make ends meet.

Wally subsequently quit his job on base and told Ermalee that he figured

it out. Anchorage was growing and construction was its future. Turns out, he was right. The family found stability and a modicum of wealth. That gave Wally the freedom to pursue his interest in politics. Over time, Wally's investments in Anchorage's growth provided a strong financial foundation for the family.

Throughout it all, Ermalee was a steadfast partner—managing the house, putting chains on the tires of the car to take the kids skiing, even ironing the pants of her hero, Charles Lindbergh, when he came to Juneau to address the Alaska Legislature. Lindbergh asked Ermalee if she would get "the help" to press his pants. Turns out Ermalee was "the help."

"Ermalee was calm, empathetic and insightful. Wally turned to her and followed her counsel. She guided and protected him, out of sight," wrote Anchorage author and historian Charles Wohlforth. She read to schoolchildren and visited with elders in the Pioneer's Homes. She visited the soup kitchens and the juvenile detention facilities. She fought for benefits for the disabled, raised awareness of fetal alcohol syndrome, and sought to protect seniors from scammers. She did it all without ever seeking credit. Ermalee was always gracious and lovely to me.

Wohlforth headlined his column remembering Ermalee Hickel's legacy with the words "Ermalee Hickel led Alaska, too." She did with dignity and grace from the beginning to the very end. It is an honor and a pleasure to share this story of an Alaskan life well lived with the Senate today.●

RECOGNIZING THE CAROLINA YOUTH DEVELOPMENT CENTER'S NEW PARTNERSHIP

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to recognize and congratulate the Carolina Youth Development Center, Cummins, Inc., and the Hootie and the Blowfish Foundation on its new partnership to provide youth aging out of foster care an independent living transitional house. The Carolina Youth Development Center has been a blessing to our State for over 200 years with their bold mission. They work tirelessly to empower and equip South Carolina's most vulnerable children by providing a safe environment, educational support, and career readiness.

Carolina Youth Development Center has an impressive 227-year history of serving the community's most vulnerable children and families, dating back to its founding as the Charleston Orphan House in 1790. The agency remains steadfast in its commitment to youth in foster care and continues to lead the way, changing lives and transforming communities.●

TRIBUTE TO BILL JOHNSTONE

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a man who has done so much for Montana. Bill Johnstone, a

native Montanan, graduate of Montana State University, and retiring chairman of D.A. Davidson, has dedicated his life to improving Montana.

His work at D.A. Davidson has helped countless Montanans financially prepare for the future. Whether it is helping Montana families plan for retirement, small business owners strategize about the future, or municipalities meet their financial needs, Bill has been there for them, but Bill's good work expanded beyond the private sector. While running a thriving company that employs more than 1,300 employees, hundreds of them Montanans, Bill has always invested his time and resources in Montana. He serves as a member of the board of regents to the Montana University system and has spent years improving schools across Montana.

Bill has also served on the International Heart Institute in Missoula and as the chairman of the Great Falls Public Schools Foundation, helping to raise funds for our public schools. His dedication to his company, his family, and his community makes Bill a model Montanan.

Helping move Montana forward is a common theme in Bill's family, his father, William A. Johnstone, served the education community for nearly 30 years and retired as acting president of Montana State University. It is clear Bill has instilled hard work and public service in his children as well. His son Anthony is an associate professor of law at the University of Montana and former solicitor general of the State of Montana and his son Jesse is the founder and president of a digital marketing agency in New York.

As Bill retires, his legacy at D.A. Davidson will live on and his lasting impact on Montana as a whole will continue to grow. Thanks for the 17 years at D.A. Davidson, Bill, and for your service to Montana. I wish you, your wife, Andrea, and your kids Anthony and Jesse nothing but the best in retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO ANNE MAXWELL LIVINGSTON

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the service of my friend Anne Maxwell Livingston. Mrs. Livingston has served since 2011 as chairwoman of the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council, CRMC, which protects Rhode Island's coastal resources through research, regulation, and restoration.

During her 6-year tenure, CRMC has been a nationally recognized leader in ocean and coastal management. One of the shining jewels of CRMC's work has been its innovative Special Area Management Plans, or SAMPs. These plans are ecosystem-based management strategies developed in collaboration with government agencies, municipalities, and other stakeholders to best manage coastal systems. During Mrs. Livingston's tenure, the council saw its

groundbreaking ocean SAMP, the first formally adopted ocean spatial plan in the country, pay real-life dividends. In developing this plan, CRMC engaged a diverse group of stakeholders and laid the groundwork for cooperation among a multitude of regulatory agencies. This effort and CRMC's continued engagement in the process paved the way for the successful development of the Nation's first offshore wind farm off the coast of Rhode Island.

The CRMC has also helped Rhode Island towns and residents understand the increasing effects of sea level rise and storm surge. Using the latest climate change predictions and state-of-the-art modeling, CRMC, in cooperation with the University of Rhode Island and others, developed an online tool, STORMTOOLS, that gives anyone with an internet connection free access to information that can be used to help decide everything from what neighborhood to buy a home in to where to site a new stormwater treatment plant. CRMC is now developing a coastal environmental risk index that can show Rhode Island homeowners individualized flood risks in 3-D.

In addition to her service on the CRMC, Mrs. Livingston has served Rhode Islanders as a board member of the Jamestown Tax Assessment Board of Review and on the board of the Girl Scouts of Rhode Island and the Jamestown Education Foundation. She also continues to serve as treasurer for the Opera House Theater & Performing Arts Center in Newport and on the advisory boards of the Dorcas International Institute of Rhode Island and the Providence Children's Museum. Mrs. Livingston is a passionate and committed leader, and I am grateful for her many years of service to our State's CRMC. ●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, 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 12:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 3 of the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act (Public Law 114-244), the Minority Leader appoints Dr. Dolores

Subia BigFoot of Norman, Oklahoma, to the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:36 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 bills:

S. 178. An act to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 652. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:26 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:

H.R. 1117. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit a report regarding certain plans regarding assistance to applicants and grantees during the response to an emergency or disaster.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 34. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-164).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 906. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for congressional notification regarding major acquisition program breaches, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-165).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 938. A bill to require notice of cost-free Federal procurement technical assistance in connection with registration of small business concerns in procurement systems (Rept. No. 115-166).

H.R. 1293. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees (Rept. No. 115-167).

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1514. A bill to amend certain Acts to reauthorize those Acts and to increase protections for wildlife, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-168).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amy Coney Barrett, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Joan Louise Larsen, of Michigan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

William L. Campbell, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Thomas Lee Robinson Parker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

Eric S. Dreiband, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Robert M. Duncan, Jr., of Kentucky, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Charles E. Peeler, of Georgia, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Georgia for the term of four years.

Bryan D. Schroder, of Alaska, to be United States Attorney for the District of Alaska for the term of four years.

(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. ROUNDS:

S. 1921. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to increase limitations and authorizations for Farm Service Agency guaranteed loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LEE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BURR, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1922. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. Kaine, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1923. A bill to prohibit firearms dealers from selling a firearm prior to the completion of a background check; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1924. A bill to authorize 2 additional district judgeships for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently modify the limitations on the deduction of interest by financial institutions which hold tax-exempt bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1926. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1927. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1928. A bill to establish a review of United States multilateral aid; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 1929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1930. A bill to establish a cost of greenhouse gases for carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide to be used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 1931. A bill to reform public financing for Presidential elections and provide for public financing for Congressional elections; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. TESTER, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1932. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide for certain wildfire mitigation assistance; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. KING, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COONS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1933. A bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1934. A bill to prevent catastrophic failure or shutdown of remote diesel power engines due to emission control devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 1935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat Indian tribal governments in the same manner as State governments for certain Federal tax purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1936. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the designation of State approving agencies for multi-State apprenticeship programs for purposes of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1937. A bill to authorize appropriations for border infrastructure construction, to provide conditional resident status to certain aliens, and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to include grounds of inadmissibility and deportability for alien members of criminal gangs and cartels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1938. A bill to establish a policy framework that offers and rewards work, strengthens the incentive to work, greatly reduces poverty, and creates new jobs in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1939. A bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1940. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer services, community partnership, and refuge education programs of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1941. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to clarify the treatment of authentic Alaska Native articles of handicraft containing nonedible migratory bird parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1942. A bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1943. A bill to amend the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act to extend the transition period for preferential treatment of certain textile and apparel articles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1944. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to allow the Commissioner of Social Security to waive the 30-day residency requirement for receipt of supplemental security income benefits for individuals who evacuate from certain territories of the United States as a result of an emergency or natural disaster; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER,

Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1945. A bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 1946. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow unpopulated census tracts that are contiguous to low-income communities to be treated as low-income communities under the new markets tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1947. A bill to improve food safety, to encourage greater production of agricultural commodities for use in the locality of production, to reauthorize and expand Department of Agriculture support of those efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 1948. A bill to abrogate the sovereign immunity of Indian tribes as a defense in inter partes review of patents; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1949. A bill to authorize demonstration projects to improve educational and housing outcomes for children; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1950. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to submit to Congress a report on promoting broadband Internet access service for veterans; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS:

S. 1951. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to award grants to nonprofit veterans service organizations to upgrade the community facilities of such organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1952. A bill to improve oversight and accountability of the financial processes of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1953. A bill to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1954. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct a central parking facility on National Zoological Park property in Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1955. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Liu Xiaobo, and collectively to all advocates of democracy and human rights in China, in recognition of their extraordinary advocacy for liberty and human rights despite repression and their impact on world peace and global understanding of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1956. A bill to authorize the Mayor of the District of Columbia and the Director of the National Park Service to enter into cooperative management agreements for the operation, maintenance, and management of

units of the National Park System in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1957. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a gasoline supply reserve in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. Res. 285. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 286. A resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in the poorest countries have access to a quality education through the Global Partnership for Education; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 287. A resolution designating October 8, 2017, as "National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 288. A resolution designating the week of October 1 through 7, 2017, as "National Community Policing Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 289. A resolution designating the week beginning October 8, 2017, as "National Wildfire Refuge Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REED, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 290. A resolution designating October 5, 2017, as "Energy Efficiency Day" in celebration of the economic and environmental benefits that have been driven by private sector innovation and Federal energy efficiency policies put in place over the past 4 decades; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 91

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 91, a bill to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title 38,

United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 293, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deferral of inclusion in gross income for capital gains reinvested in opportunity zones.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. PETERS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 503

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 503, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make publicly available certain regulatory records relating to the administration of the Animal Welfare Act and the Horse Protection Act, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the use of an alternative depreciation system for taxpayers violating rules under the Animal Welfare Act and the Horse Protection Act, and for other purposes.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 818

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 818, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with disabilities to save additional amounts in their ABLE accounts above the current annual maximum contribution if they work and earn income.

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 818, supra.

S. 825

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 825, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 980

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for meals.

S. 1084

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1084, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

S. 1085

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1085, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for convicted murderers who kill or target America's public safety officers.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1510

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1510, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for online voter registration and other changes and to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to improve voting, to require the Election Assistance Commission to study and report on best practices for election cybersecurity and election audits, and to make grants to States to implement those best practices recommended by the Commission.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1589, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1595

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1595, a bill to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, *supra*.

S. 1690

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide greater support to students with dependents, and for other purposes.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 1706

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1706, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1719

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to eliminate duties on imports of recreational performance outerwear, to establish the Sustainable Textile and Apparel Research Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1756

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1756, a bill to improve the processes by which environmental documents are prepared and permits and applications are processed and regulated by Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1823

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1823, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that houses of worship are eligible for certain disaster relief and emergency assistance on terms equal to other eligible private nonprofit facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to clarify that non-commercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not in interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1883, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to publish a final rule to provide for the screening, testing, and treatment for sleep disorders of individuals operating commercial vehicles.

S. 1916

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1916, a bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of certain firearm accessories, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 245

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 245, a resolution calling on the Government of Iran to release unjustly detained United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 245, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1927. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I reintroduced the Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act, a bill that would enable faculty working less than full-time to participate in the Public Service Student Loan Forgiveness Program.

Contingent faculty members are like full-time instructors. They have advanced degrees. They teach classes and spend many hours outside the classroom preparing for class. They hold office hours, grade papers, and give feedback to students. They provide advice and write letters of recommendation. Students rely on them. Since most adjuncts have advanced degrees and, as the 63 percent of graduate degree recipients who borrow have an average of almost \$59,000 in student loans, they are among the 44 million Americans with student debt.

The Public Service Loan Forgiveness program is meant to encourage graduates to go into public service by offering student loan forgiveness for eligible Federal loans after ten years of full-time work in government or the non-profit sector. Public service fields like nursing, military service, and public health qualify. And many education jobs qualify, including full-time work at public universities and part-time work at community colleges in high-needs subject areas or areas of shortage. But other faculty members, those who work part-time, are not eligible for loan forgiveness because the law requires an annual average of 30 hours per week to qualify for the program. For adjunct faculty working on a contingent basis—many of whom may only teach one or two classes while holding down other part-time jobs to make ends meet—this requirement can be difficult or impossible to meet, even when they are putting in more than 30 hours of work each week.

The number of faculty hours given for each class is calculated differently at different schools. Some schools give one hour per hour in the classroom while others actually take into consideration the time required outside the classroom. So, even as these faculty members are working hard to provide quality instruction for their students, often without the option of moving into a tenured, full-time position, their public service is not recognized by the current Public Service Loan Forgiveness program.

The Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2017 would solve this by amending the Higher Education Act to expand the definition of a “public service job” to include a part-time faculty member who teaches at least one course at an eligible institution of higher education. They would still have to meet all the other requirements to qualify for the public service loan forgiveness program, including making 120 on-time payments while employed at a qualifying institution, and they could not be employed full-time elsewhere at the same time. I believe it corrects a major flaw in the current system and rewards individuals for their contribution to public service rather than penalize them for the number of hours they work.

This bill would benefit someone like Brittany, an adjunct professor in southern Illinois. Brittany finished her graduate degree in 2013 and still has over \$70,000 in student loan debt today. This debt has prevented her from attending law school, her longtime dream, and makes it challenging to put money aside for her retirement. This debt is also putting her children’s future at risk—Brittany will still be paying off her own loans when it is time for her now four-month old child to attend college. This bill would ensure that Brittany, and thousands like her, could secure their family’s financial future by earning credit towards the Public Service Loan Forgiveness for

loan payments made while teaching, regardless of the fact that she isn’t full-time faculty.

Unfortunately, for all their contributions to their colleges and the students they work with, adjunct faculty like Brittany often don’t have the same employment benefits or job security as their colleagues. The number of classes they teach every semester varies. To make ends meet, these professors often end up teaching classes at more than one school in the same semester, getting paid about \$3,000 per class and making an average annual income that hovers around minimum wage. This also means that, in some parts of the country, they spend as much time commuting as they do teaching.

Nationally, over half of all higher education faculty work on a contingent basis. In the past, these were a minority of professors who were hired to teach an occasional class because they could bring experience to the classroom in a specific field or industry. Over time, as university budgets have tightened and it has gotten more expensive to hire full-time, tenure track professors, higher education institutions have increasingly relied on adjuncts.

From 1991 to 2015, the number of part-time faculty in the U.S. increased two and a half times from 291,000 to over 743,000. At the same time, the percentage of professors holding tenure and tenure-track positions has been steadily decreasing from 45 percent of all instructors in 1975 to only 29 percent in 2015. The number of full-time instructors, tenured and non-tenured, now makes up less than half of all professors on U.S. campuses. Today, a majority of the 1.5 million faculty employees at public and non-profit colleges and universities in the United States work on a part-time, contingent basis.

Illinois colleges rely heavily on adjuncts. In 2015, 52 percent of all faculty at all Title IV degree-granting institutions in the state—more than 31,700 faculty employees—worked on a part-time basis. This is a 32.4 percent increase in part-time faculty in Illinois compared to a 7 percent increase in full-time faculty since 2002.

This bill does not fix the growing reliance by our higher education system on part-time professors who are underpaid and undervalued. But it would ensure that members of the contingent faculty workforce are no longer unfairly excluded from the loan forgiveness program for public servants. I would like to thank my colleague, Senator AL FRANKEN from Minnesota, for joining me in this effort. I hope my other colleagues will join us to ensure this program benefits faculty members who provide our students with a quality education.

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. 1927

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 “Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY.

Section 455(m)(3)(B)(ii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(m)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “teaching as” and inserting the following: “teaching—

“(I) as”;

(2) by striking “, foreign language faculty, and part-time faculty at community colleges), as determined by the Secretary.” and inserting “and foreign language faculty), as determined by the Secretary; or”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) as a part-time faculty member or instructor who—

“(aa) teaches not less than 1 course at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a)), a postsecondary vocational institution (as defined in section 102(c)), or a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b)); and

“(bb) is not employed on a full-time basis by any other employer.”.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1937. A bill to authorize appropriations for border infrastructure construction, to provide conditional resident status to certain aliens, and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to include grounds of inadmissibility and deportability for alien members of criminal gangs and cartels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Border Security and Deferred Action Recipient Relief Act, which I am introducing.

This bill offers solutions to the serious problems facing us with regard to border security, while at the same time addressing the needs for a legislative solution for those issues faced by the children who were brought here through no fault of their own.

With respect to the border, this bill provides \$1.6 billion in funding for border security measures that the President requested and the House has already approved in a bipartisan vote. As an Arizonan, I am more than familiar with the steps we need to take to increase border security. We have a better situation on the border than we have had in a while, but there are still measures that need to be taken.

In addition to the appropriate barriers that will aid in preventing illegal crossings, we need access roads that actually get to the border. If there is one issue I hear from property owners, ranchers, Border Patrol agents, and others near the border, it is that they need better access. We have had an issue with regard to roads that are used by the Border Control that are paid for by the county. It is a situation that needs to be resolved, and it will benefit all of us who travel near the border. This bill addresses that. The road issue was also raised by the GAO. I requested a study on behalf of my constituents,

along with my colleagues, to see what we could do with the roads and access situation. GAO came back with recommendations, and this would implement some of the recommendations.

The bill also aids law enforcement by ensuring the swift deportation of individuals determined to be members of violent gangs and drug cartels.

I would also like to thank Congresswoman BARBARA COMSTOCK for her leadership on this issue by sponsoring the Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act, which passed the House.

With respect to the children brought here through no fault of their own, this bill takes a measure that has already earned bipartisan support in the House of Representatives, the Recognizing America's Children Act, which provides a solution for the DACA kids. These young immigrants were brought here as children and simply know no other country. For all intents and purposes, these young people consider themselves Americans. If we can protect these DACA recipients and provide solutions to better secure our borders at the same time, that is a win-win.

The President and Congress both want to improve border security. We both want to respond to the threat of dangerous gangs and drug cartels. We both want to arrive at a legislative solution for the rescission of the DACA Program that benefits those who want to contribute to their communities and to the American dream. This bill is the best way to thread the needle and deliver what the President has asked for, what the Congress wants, and what my constituents in Arizona deserve. These issues are far too important for us to delay.

To be clear, I will work with anyone to support any number of proposals that accomplish these goals, but I believe that the straightforward approach of the Border Security and Deferred Action Recipient Relief Act, which I am introducing today, is the best chance we have to put this bill on the President's desk.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1942. A bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss and bring awareness to the obligation that we have to never forget what is happening to way too many Native American women in this country.

For too long, the disproportionate incidents of violence against Native American women have gone unnoticed, unreported, or underreported, and it is time to address this issue head-on. That is what I intend to do today and in the remaining days of my time in

the Senate, until we actually get a bill passed.

There is no official database or requirement for information collection regarding the number of missing and murdered Native women. In most cases, the only records of them are records that have been provided to us by the families and friends of the victims. It is critical that Congress push the U.S. Department of Justice and the FBI to work with Tribal communities to come up with culturally appropriate protocols for responding to cases of missing and murdered Native women.

I would like to take this time to honor Savanna LaFontaine-Greywind, whose story has been told on the news in North Dakota and nationally and who has been on the forefront of my mind since introducing this bill.

On August 19, Savanna, a 22-year-old member of the Spirit Lake Tribe, who was 8 months pregnant, went upstairs to her neighbor's apartment in Fargo, ND, after being invited to try on a dress for alterations. While she was there, what awaited her in that apartment were truly horrific acts of violence. Although Savanna's baby daughter survived and is now safe with her father and grandparents, that was the last time anyone who loved Savanna saw her alive.

After 8 days of searching for Savanna by the family and the community, her body was finally found by chance by kayakers in a nearby river. Her body was wrapped in plastic and duct taped. Her death was an incredible tragedy and, unfortunately, one that happens way too often to Native women.

While the news of Savanna's death was heard around the world, thousands of indigenous women are murdered and disappear each year, with many of those cases being ignored or forgotten.

Over my decades in public service, I have worked with Tribal communities on issues that involve violence against Native women. In response to those talks and to this latest tragedy, today I am introducing legislation that would help tackle the barriers to bringing justice for missing and murdered Native women across the country.

My bill, which is named after Savanna, would work to improve Tribal access to Federal databases for missing persons. It would promote interjurisdictional collaboration by establishing protocols for responding to cases of missing and murdered Native Americans, and it would require the collection of data related to missing and murdered Native women.

Native women are an inherently vulnerable population whose voices are still not heard by most people in power. Across rural North Dakota, women living on reservations face unique challenges when dealing with violence. Lack of access to emergency services, lack of access to law enforcement officers, lack of access to an AMBER Alert system, and confidential victim services that are not provided—these all act as barriers to women get-

ting the help that they desperately need.

Unfortunately, there is no official database or mandated database collection on the total number of missing and murdered Native women in our country. This has added to not knowing what the actual magnitude of this epidemic really is and has resulted in several Tribal members sending me stories and handwritten lists of the names of missing and murdered women that people have gathered just from their collective memory.

I would like to share some of the stories that I have been so honored to receive from family members. Telling these stories—and giving me the ability to tell these stories—is not easy because every time you tell the story, you relive the story. These tragedies still hurt deeply. Even years after the murder, they still absolutely relive that experience. I know they have given me these stories to tell for one simple reason: because they pray and they hope and they dream that giving me these stories may change the outcome for some other family.

I am going to start by talking about these wonderful women—these beautiful women. Up at the far right-hand corner with her beautiful baby is Stella Marie Trottier-Graves. Stella Marie was born and grew up in Belcourt, ND, and was a member of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa. She spent many years traveling the world with her husband, who served in the U.S. Air Force, and their three children. The family lived in Florida, Germany, Japan, and Arizona. Everywhere they went, Stella quickly made friends and proudly shared her Chippewa culture. She was loved and adored by all who met her for living an adventurous and fearless life.

In July 2009, Stella and her family moved back to Belcourt, ND, and she started to attend Turtle Mountain Community College. On September 16, 2010, Stella and her cousin were at the local bar when she decided to stay behind with other people they knew. According to witnesses, Stella left with another couple to continue the evening out.

Stella's body was later found in a male Tribal member's pickup in an open field on the reservation. It wasn't until 13 days later that the family was officially notified by law enforcement of Stella's death.

Throughout the investigation, there were a lot of rumors and misinformation, which made it difficult to find the murderer or the murderers. People who were with Stella the night of her death said that they were never questioned, and information provided was never followed up on. No one has ever been charged or convicted for this murder, and the last hours of Stella's life remain unknown.

Stella was an incredible woman who was loved by all who knew her. Her family, her children, and her Tribe deserve justice.

Monica Wickre is pictured here with those beautiful earrings and the red

shirt. Monica was a 42-year-old mother of three who was born and raised in Belcourt on the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa reservation and lived near Aberdeen, SD.

After a night out with friends on April 7, 1993, Monica never returned home. Her relatives grew concerned when they had not heard from or seen Monica for several days. Eventually, the family filed a missing persons report and started to talk to friends and neighbors. The detective assigned to the case worked closely with the community and the family and assured them he was working diligently on this case.

In June of that year, a canoeist found Monica's badly decomposed body in the James River outside Aberdeen. Throughout the next several years, new detectives were assigned to the case, each having to basically start over and work with limited notes, interviews, and evidence from the previous investigators. A couple of times, the police told the family that they had a suspect or were close to arresting someone for Monica's murder, but there was never enough information to charge the suspect. This has resulted in nearly 25 years of heartache for Monica's family and her friends.

Monica's family wants justice for their daughter, sister, and mother, and they all want closure. Although the case is no longer active, the family continues to bring awareness about Monica's case in the hope that someone will come forward with information that will, in fact, help solve it.

Monica Lisa Two Eagle is the woman with the dark hair in the floral print shirt. She was a member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe and one of 14 children. She was kind, caring, and athletic. In the winter of 1979, Phil Two Eagle saw his sister Mona Lisa, who was in her early twenties, leave the siblings' house and get into a red-and-white pickup with a couple of men. Mona Lisa never returned.

In the following days, the family and local law enforcement searched for her on horseback. Taking it upon themselves, they searched for her on horseback. About 2 weeks after she went missing, Mona Lisa's father and brother found her frozen in a pasture near their home. She had been beaten, possibly raped, and left alone in a blizzard. Rumors ran wild that family and law enforcement tried to solve the crime, but, even to this day, no one was ever convicted or even charged. The two men who were last seen with Mona Lisa all those years ago are still running free, while the family lives every day with the lack of justice.

Lakota Rae Renville, the woman in the black-and-white photo, is the last victim I want to talk about. I want to thank her family, who are here today and who have honored me and trusted me with her memory. I want to help them understand how grateful I am, but I also want them to know that sharing her story will help raise aware-

ness about the crimes of missing and murdered indigenous people.

Lakota was a member of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Dakota Bands of North and South Dakota, who, despite being shy and reserved, had a solid group of friends who supported her and even helped her excel in school. After graduation, Lakota spent time taking care of her family, especially her nieces and nephews.

In 2005 Lakota met a man online and unexpectedly relocated to Missouri, unbeknownst to her family. With most details still unknown 12 years later, the family is left with more questions than answers. What they do know is that she was forced into sex trafficking and manipulated against her will.

In October of 2005, Lakota's family was called and told that her body was found badly beaten, wrapped in carpet padding and a blanket in an open gravel pit in Missouri. Local investigators brought in and subsequently let go dozens of suspects and, to this day, have not brought her murderer to justice.

Lakota was never given a chance to become a mother or pursue that bright future that surely lay ahead of her. She was robbed of a life she had yet to experience, a life that was certain to be filled with love from her family and deep appreciation from her family.

These are not isolated cases. This goes on every day in America.

I want to make a point of how discouraging it, so many times, when you see events unfolding where it may be that a young girl goes missing in a Caribbean island and the world is turned upside down looking for her or when we hear a story of someone who comes from maybe a more affluent and wealthy family who goes missing and we turn over every stone to find them. Yet that is not the story for very many indigenous women.

When you look at the importance of what we do today, probably the most important thing we can do is to tell these stories, and from telling these stories we have an opportunity to really change. We can't ignore that frequently for Native people, they are not wrong to believe that they are the forgotten people of this country. Way too often, the first Americans become the last Americans.

Under the Savanna's Act, the Attorney General, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, must consult with the Tribes on how to improve Tribal access to Federal criminal information databases, such as the National Crime Information Center and the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System. We need to ensure that Tribal law enforcement has up-to-date information on missing Native women and better communication—in fact, essential—with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and Tribal law enforcement agencies so cases like the ones you have heard of today don't go unnoticed or uninvestigated.

Jurisdictional issues are a huge barrier in Indian Country to responding to

and prosecuting crimes committed on Tribal lands. Standardized protocols must be established in order to give a quicker response to Native women going missing. The complexity of jurisdiction on Tribal lands can slow down an investigation, but it is not an excuse. It can waste crucial time at the beginning of an investigation or a case, but it is not an excuse. If we do not act rapidly, we know we lose precious time to prevent homicides and to bring a woman safely home and help apprehend the perpetrators.

In one case study alone done by the National Institute of Justice, 97 percent of Native women experience violence by a non-Native perpetrator. This number emphasizes what I have long said, that historical trauma is a major factor of violence against Native women, and perpetrators feel that Tribal lands give them a free pass from the law. This can no longer be tolerated, and jurisdictional issues must be addressed. It cannot be the excuse for inaction.

Although we don't know the total number of missing and murdered Native women, it is clear, from all of the stories and from the statistics that we do have, that the rates at which Native American women experience violence is intrinsically related to the likelihood of their going missing, being murdered, and forced into sex trafficking.

Here are just some of the statistics collected by the National Institute of Justice, the Government Accountability Office, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention regarding violence against Native women. In 2016, 5,712 cases of missing Native women were reported to the National Crime Information Center, and 125 of those cases were in my State of Dakota alone. On some reservations, Native women are murdered at more than 10 times the national average. I want to repeat that. On some reservations, Native women are murdered at more than 10 times the national average.

American Indians and Alaskan Natives are two times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault compared to all other races.

In 2010, we found that the U.S. attorneys declined to prosecute nearly 52 percent of violent crime that occurred in Indian Country. Homicide is the third leading cause of death among American Indians and Alaskan Native women between 10 and 24 years old.

These high rates of violence, including domestic violence, sex assault, and human trafficking, must stop. We must work together to combat domestic violence and human trafficking in Indian Country.

Just last week, the Indian Affairs Committee held a hearing to discuss the lack of services provided for Indian Country regarding the horrific acts of violence and human trafficking of Native women. Just yesterday, while questioning one of the officials at the Department of the Interior about the need to do training in human trafficking at our casinos, he simply said:

I thought you were going to ask me about Indian gaming. I quickly said: I am asking you about Indian gaming because all of this works together.

If we do not work together in every institution of the Federal Government, in every institution of the State government, and in every institution of Tribal government, we will never make progress in providing the security that we have in this building, and the security that we enjoy as White women will never be realized for women living on the reservation in Indian Country. We cannot let this continue.

There are countless more stories like Savanna's, Stella's, Mona Lisa's, Monica's, and Lakota's that we will never know. It is time for Congress to recognize this epidemic and take action to prevent these stories and find out just how many stories there really are. It is time to give voice to these voiceless women. It is time to bring their perpetrators to justice and give a voice to the families who are struggling even today—sometimes decades later—to understand how this can happen in America. They seem to be second-class citizens.

I think that is what we know. I am working with very many of my colleagues on the other side. This isn't a partisan issue.

I have been joined by my wonderful colleague from the great State of Alaska. I think the first time we ever met, this was the topic of conversation: What is the security for Indian children, security for Indian women, and Alaskan Native women? We knew because both of us have traveled extensively in our States and spent a lot of time in the indigenous populations.

When family members ask us why this is happening, we frequently don't have an answer.

I know that in my State jurisdictional issues provide some barriers to actually getting this done, but that is an excuse. We need to do better.

With that, I want to yield the floor to my wonderful colleague from the great State of Alaska, who once again is joining me and leading her side of the aisle to bring attention to these issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge and thank the Senator from North Dakota. She has been a champion for the Native people, the indigenous people around the country, including in my State of Alaska. Whether it is working to address the issues related to childhood trauma, which so many of our young Native children face, or the issues relating to domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking—these are scourges that we see directed, unfortunately, at so many of our Native women in the State of Alaska, in the State of North Dakota, and around the country.

She has cited the statistics. I think sometimes we just get numb by the statistics. When you are told that you

are four times the national average, that sounds bad. But what does that mean? When you put a face to it, when you hear the tragedy repeated through the stories, these are not just statistics that we are speaking of. These are real women. These are our sisters. These are our neighbors. These are our friends, and these are human beings who deserve to be respected in their lives but also respected in other tragic deaths. How we work to address these difficult issues needs to be a focus and a priority for us.

So I appreciate what the Senator from North Dakota is doing in bringing attention to our Nation's lackluster—and that is kind of a polite term here—response to the tragedy of missing and murdered Native women and girls.

I am proud to lend my voice to the proposition that Congress, in the exercise of our trust responsibility to our Native peoples, has a responsibility to do more. You would think that that trust responsibility demands us to be paying even closer attention, and yet it seems that we just withdraw from that, that that responsibility is not acknowledged.

Now, it is not often here in the United States that we benchmark our treatment of indigenous peoples against Canada, but in this case, there is actually a compelling difference between Canada's national response to the tragedy of missing and murdered Native women and our seeming indifference here in the United States.

Down in southeastern Alaska, right across on the Canadian side, lies a town called Prince Rupert. It is in British Columbia. The Alaskan ferry comes in from Washington State and stops in Prince Rupert and then moves into Alaska. Prince Rupert is also the terminus of Highway 16, and the locals refer to Highway 16 as the "Highway of Tears." They refer to it as the "Highway of Tears" because it is a road on which Native women and girls have vanished for decades now. The question is, How many? Who is disappearing? Some would say as few as 12 and perhaps as many as 43. CBS News devoted a segment of its news magazine show "48 Hours" to the Highway of Tears.

Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau committed 54 million Canadian dollars to a national inquiry into missing and murdered indigenous women and girls. I will admit that there is some controversy over whether the national inquiry is actually fulfilling its mission, but my point here is that Canada stepped up. They have acknowledged that this is an issue, that this is a problem, and they have responded to the disproportionate victimization of Native women and girls, and they have done so in a tangible way. Here in the United States, as my friend and colleague has noted, we are more than a bit late in acknowledging that the problem even exists.

Earlier this year, the Senators from Montana—both Senator DAINES and Senator TESTER—were successful in

designating May 5, 2017, through a resolution, as the National Day of Awareness on Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls. The resolution recites that some Tribal communities face murder rates that are 10 times the national average, as Senator HEITKAMP has noted. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, homicide was the third leading cause of death among Native women between the ages of 10 and 24 years and the fifth leading cause of death for Alaska Native women between 25 and 34 years of age. So we are trying to raise attention and awareness. We are trying to shine a spotlight on this issue.

I certainly think it is high time that Federal law enforcement answer the question, Why? Why is the murder rate for Native women so high, and why are we not addressing it in a comprehensive fashion? The Senator from North Dakota has pointed out that in many areas, jurisdictional issues are at play, and I agree. That is not an excuse. We acknowledge that we have challenges with jurisdictions. Let's figure this out. Women are disappearing and dying.

In Alaska, it is not so much jurisdictional issues; it is the fact that in far too many of our communities, we lack any law enforcement presence. We might have a VPSO—a village safety police officer—but they are not armed. They are very limited in terms of their ability to provide for levels of enforcement. More frustrating than so much of that is that women who have been victimized feel as though reporting doesn't get them anywhere because there is no follow-through. There is no prosecution. There has been no effort that will allow them to have any level of recourse, much less justice, visited upon them.

As we talk about these issues of jurisdiction and law enforcement and the rates that we see, I think we need to be clear that the discussion today—the call for justice—is not driven by statistics and rates. It is driven by their faces. It is driven by the loss of people's daughters, people's siblings, people's friends, including Savannah and Stella and Nicole and Mona Lisa. These are all real people, real women with names, with faces, with families.

In Alaska, the face we so often associate with the lack of progress when it comes to addressing the issue of missing and murdered Native women is the face of Sophie Sergie. This year marks the 24th anniversary of the death of Sophie Sergie from Pitkas Point. This is a Yup'ik village in southwest Alaska.

On August 26 of 1993, Sophie was found dead in the women's bathroom dorm on the University of Alaska Fairbanks campus. She was raped. She was shot dead. It is believed that her body remained in that bathroom for some 13 hours before it was found. The murder weapon was never recovered. That case is still a cold case 24 years later. But we don't forget Sophie Sergie, just as

we don't forget the women the Senator from North Dakota has shared stories about. We cannot forget these women.

Unlike the tragedies along the Highway of Tears, we really don't know how many Native women and girls have gone missing and murdered. That is a big part of the problem. But I will tell my colleagues that if you ask advocates for Native women, the answer comes back: It is no secret. We all know somebody. We all know somebody who has gone missing, somebody who has been murdered.

That was the testimony of Tammy Jerue. She is the executive director for the Alaska Native Women's Resource Center, and she testified before a congressional briefing last February. Tammy told the briefing that her organization has documented as many as 50 names of women. When we think about it, numbers on that order were significant enough for Prime Minister Trudeau to commission a national inquiry. So it causes us to ask the question, What about us? What number do we have to get to before there is a call to action, before we wake up and say: This is not acceptable. This is not acceptable that our Native women are disappearing, are being murdered.

Native women are asking why Federal law enforcement has no protocol for addressing the crisis in our Indian Country, why there is a lack of coordination among criminal justice agencies in this country to set aside the jurisdictional challenges and investigate these tragedies in an effective manner, and why there is a lack of victim services.

In the Indian Affairs Committee, we had a hearing on human trafficking, sex trafficking. It was pretty revealing about the lack of victim services—specific—that could be there to help our Native victims. Right now, the families of missing and murdered Native women in Alaska have to cover the cost of a traditional burial. They have to cover the cost of immediate long-term counseling, and so many other expenses they can't afford. We maintain a victims of crime fund here in this country to address these sorts of costs, but there is no dedicated Tribal funding stream. We have had some pretty bipartisan efforts here in the Senate to establish one, but we haven't even been able to do that bare minimum to provide for the victims.

The issue we are discussing today is tragic and frustrating. It is depressing. But to remain silent is to truly further marginalize Native women and girls, and that is unacceptable. Perhaps we are not going to devote tens of millions of dollars to a national inquiry; However, it is high time that we acknowledge a problem that has failed to make headlines in this country, because you first have to acknowledge that a problem exists to make headway in addressing that problem.

So, again, I thank the Senator from North Dakota for her strong and steadfast advocacy on behalf of not only our

Native women but our Native children, our indigenous peoples across this country. I appreciate all that is being done, and I look forward to working with her again as we try to shine a brighter light on a very tragic situation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1945. A bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MENENDEZ. 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. 1945

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 "Keep Americans Safe Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (29) the following:

"(30) The term 'large capacity ammunition feeding device'—

"(A) means a magazine, belt, drum, feed strip, helical feeding device, or similar device, including any such device joined or coupled with another in any manner, that has an overall capacity of, or that can be readily restored, changed, or converted to accept, more than 10 rounds of ammunition; and

"(B) does not include an attached tubular device designed to accept, and capable of operating only with, .22 caliber rimfire ammunition.

"(31) The term 'qualified law enforcement officer' has the meaning given the term in section 926B."

SEC. 3. RESTRICTIONS ON LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (u) the following:

"(v)(1) It shall be unlawful for a person to import, sell, manufacture, transfer, or possess, in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, a large capacity ammunition feeding device.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the possession of any large capacity ammunition feeding device otherwise lawfully possessed on or before the date of enactment of the Keep Americans Safe Act.

"(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

"(A) the importation for, manufacture for, sale to, transfer to, or possession by the United States or a department or agency of the United States or a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision of a State, or a sale or transfer to or possession by a qualified law enforcement officer employed by the United States or a department or agency of the United States or a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision of a State for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off-duty), or a sale or

transfer to or possession by a campus law enforcement officer for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off-duty);

"(B) the importation for, or sale or transfer to a licensee under title I of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 for purposes of establishing and maintaining an on-site physical protection system and security organization required by Federal law, or possession by an employee or contractor of such licensee on-site for such purposes or off-site for purposes of licensee-authorized training or transportation of nuclear materials;

"(C) the possession, by an individual who is retired in good standing from service with a law enforcement agency and is not otherwise prohibited from receiving ammunition, of a large capacity ammunition feeding device—

"(i) sold or transferred to the individual by the agency upon such retirement; or

"(ii) that the individual purchased, or otherwise obtained, for official use before such retirement; or

"(D) the importation, sale, manufacture, transfer, or possession of any large capacity ammunition feeding device by a licensed manufacturer or licensed importer for the purposes of testing or experimentation authorized by the Attorney General.

"(4) For purposes of paragraph (3)(A), the term 'campus law enforcement officer' means an individual who is—

"(A) employed by a private institution of higher education that is eligible for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

"(B) responsible for the prevention or investigation of crime involving injury to persons or property, including apprehension or detention of persons for such crimes;

"(C) authorized by Federal, State, or local law to carry a firearm, execute search warrants, and make arrests; and

"(D) recognized, commissioned, or certified by a government entity as a law enforcement officer."

(b) IDENTIFICATION MARKINGS FOR LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.—Section 923(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: "A large capacity ammunition feeding device manufactured after the date of enactment of the Keep Americans Safe Act shall be identified by a serial number and the date on which the device was manufactured or made, legibly and conspicuously engraved or cast on the device, and such other identification as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe."

(c) SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE OF LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.—Section 924(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting "or large capacity ammunition feeding device" after "firearm or ammunition" each place the term appears;

(B) by inserting "or large capacity ammunition feeding device" after "firearms or ammunition" each place the term appears; and

(C) by striking "(k)" and inserting "(k), or (v)";

(2) in paragraph (2)(C), by inserting "or large capacity ammunition feeding devices" after "firearms or quantities of ammunition"; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(E), by inserting "922(v)," after "922(n),".

SEC. 4. PENALTIES.

Section 924(a)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "or (q)" and inserting "(q), or (v)".

SEC. 5. USE OF BYRNE GRANTS FOR BUY-BACK PROGRAMS FOR LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968

(34 U.S.C. 10152(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(I) Compensation for surrendered large capacity ammunition feeding devices, as that term is defined in section 921 of title 18, United States Code, under buy-back programs for large capacity ammunition feeding devices.”.

SEC. 6. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 285—HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF DR. SAMUEL DUBOIS COOK

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 285

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook was born on November 21, 1928, in Griffin, Georgia;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in history from Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia;

Whereas, as a student, Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook was a friend and classmate of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and a leader at Morehouse College, where he served as student body president and founded the campus chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook earned a Master of Arts in Political Science and a Doctor of Philosophy from Ohio State University;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook is a veteran who served in the United States Army during the Korean War;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook taught at Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Atlanta University, the University of Illinois, and the University of California, Los Angeles, before becoming a faculty member at Duke University in Durham, North Carolina;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook spent his life working for social justice and equality;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook distinguished himself as an educator, scholar, thinker, activist, and public servant;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook broke racial barriers as the first African American to hold either a regular or tenured faculty appointment at a predominantly white southern college or university, when he received an appointment at Duke University;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook also broke racial barriers in his field by serving as the first African American president of the Southern Political Science Association;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook endeavored to advance interracial harmony;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook left an indelible imprint on Dillard University, a historically black university in New Orleans, Louisiana, as its president for more than 2 decades;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook was appointed to the National Council on the Humanities by President Jimmy Carter and appointed to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council by President Bill Clinton;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook served as vice president of the American Political Science Association, president of the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, and chair of the Presidents of the United Negro College Fund;

Whereas Duke University established the Samuel DuBois Cook Society, the Samuel DuBois Cook Center on Social Equity, the Samuel DuBois Cook professorship, and the Samuel DuBois Cook Postdoctoral Fellowship;

Whereas Ohio State University established the Samuel DuBois Cook Summer Academy and the Samuel DuBois Cook graduate fellowship, to honor the work and achievements of Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook;

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook died on May 29, 2017; and

Whereas Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook is considered to be a trailblazer who lived a life of integrity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the life and achievements of Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook.

SENATE RESOLUTION 286—SUPPORTING THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN ENSURING CHILDREN IN THE POOREST COUNTRIES HAVE ACCESS TO A QUALITY EDUCATION THROUGH THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION

Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 286

Whereas access to quality education reduces poverty, advances economic prosperity, improves peace and security, and strengthens public health;

Whereas the 2016 Global Education Monitoring (GEM) Report, the globally recognized annual accountability tool on the status of education internationally, found that an estimated 263,000,000 children and youth are out of school worldwide, with girls still more likely to be out of school than their male peers in most of the developing world;

Whereas a 2015 GEM Report found that two-thirds of the world's out-of-school children live in countries affected by fragility and conflict;

Whereas a 2016 GEM Report found that sub-Saharan Africa remains the region with the highest out-of-school rates for all age groups and of the 61,000,000 out-of-school children of primary school age, 33,000,000, or more than half, live in sub-Saharan Africa;

Whereas the 2011 World Health Organization's World Report on Disability has found an estimated 90 percent of children with disabilities under age 18 in the developing world do not attend school;

Whereas a 2012 GEM Report found that 250,000,000 primary schoolchildren are failing to learn basic literacy and numeracy skills, 130,000,000 of whom have attended at least four years of school;

Whereas a 2011 GEM Report found that educating all students in low-income countries with basic reading skills could lead to 171,000,000 people lifted out of poverty, a 12 percent drop in global poverty;

Whereas a 1999 World Bank study on conflict found every year of school decreases the chance of male youth engaging in violent conflict by 20 percent;

Whereas a 2011 GEM Report reported that an educated mother is more likely to have her children vaccinated, and girls in school are three times less likely to be infected

with HIV than their peers who are not in school;

Whereas the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) is the only public-private global partnership exclusively dedicated to education in the world's poorest countries;

Whereas GPE eligible countries are home to approximately 870,000,000 children and youth, which represent 78 percent of out-of-school children;

Whereas GPE support resulted in 72,000,000 more children in primary school in 2015 than in 2002 and a 10 percent increase in primary school completion over that same period in GPE partner countries;

Whereas GPE support to partner countries has achieved a 71 percent primary completion rate for girls in 2014 compared with 56 percent in 2002;

Whereas 60 percent of GPE's spending is in countries affected by conflict or fragility and helped these countries to increase their primary school completion rates from 56 percent in 2000 to 69 percent in 2015;

Whereas GPE incentivizes developing country governments to increase their own domestic financing for education, which has resulted in partner countries pledging \$26,000,000,000 for their own domestic financing during GPE's 2014 replenishment conference;

Whereas support for GPE complements the United States Government's bilateral basic education programs by fostering coordination among all key partners, ensuring the development of national education sector plans, and building on the commitment of developing country governments;

Whereas, on April 20, 2017, GPE called on donors and developing country partners to fund a \$3,100,000,000, three-year plan to support 89 developing countries in improving the quality of and access to education for 870,000,000 children and youth and provide education plan implementation grants to 67 developing countries, covering 64 percent of out-of-school children;

Whereas GPE is urging developing country governments to allocate 20 percent of government expenditure to education and philanthropic and private sector donors to increase their contributions; and

Whereas, with support from donors, GPE will be able to ensure 19,000,000 more children complete primary school, 6,600,000 more children complete lower secondary school, 1,700,000 more teachers are trained, 23,800 classrooms are built, and 204,000,000 textbooks are distributed, bringing new hope to a generation of children and youth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms the leadership and commitment of the United States Government to improving access to quality education for the poorest and most marginalized children and youth worldwide, which is critical to global stability, economic prosperity, and poverty elimination;

(2) supports the mission and goals of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) to mobilize global and national efforts to contribute to the achievement of equitable, quality education and learning, with a focus on effective and efficient education systems and strong education financing;

(3) recognizes that United States Government investments in bilateral basic education are complemented by GPE's education systems approach and convening authority; and

(4) encourages increased commitment and investment by the United States Government, international donors, private foundations, and private sector donors through the GPE to the global effort to ensure children and youth are in school and learning throughout the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 287—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 8, 2017, AS “NATIONAL HYDROGEN AND FUEL CELL DAY”

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 287

Whereas hydrogen, which has an atomic mass of 1.008, is the most abundant chemical substance in the universe;

Whereas the United States is a world leader in the development and deployment of fuel cell and hydrogen technologies;

Whereas hydrogen fuel cells played an instrumental role in the United States space program, helping the United States achieve the mission of landing a man on the moon;

Whereas private industry, Federal and State governments, national laboratories, and institutions of higher education continue to improve fuel cell and hydrogen technologies to address the most pressing energy, environmental, and economic issues of the United States;

Whereas fuel cells utilizing hydrogen and hydrogen-rich fuels to generate electricity are clean, efficient, and resilient technologies being sold for stationary and backup power, zero-emission light duty motor vehicles and buses, industrial vehicles, and portable power;

Whereas stationary fuel cells are being placed in service for continuous and backup power to provide business and energy consumers with reliable power in the event of grid outages;

Whereas stationary fuel cells can help reduce water use, as compared to traditional power generation technologies;

Whereas fuel cell electric light duty motor vehicles and buses that utilize hydrogen can completely replicate the experience of internal combustion vehicles, including comparable range and refueling times;

Whereas hydrogen fuel cell industrial vehicles are being deployed at logistical hubs and warehouses across the United States and exported to facilities in Europe and Asia;

Whereas hydrogen is a nontoxic gas that can be derived from a variety of domestically available traditional and renewable resources, including solar, wind, biogas, and the abundant supply of natural gas in the United States;

Whereas hydrogen and fuel cells can store energy to help enhance the grid and maximize opportunities to deploy renewable energy;

Whereas the United States produces and uses more than 11,000,000 metric tons of hydrogen per year; and

Whereas engineers and safety code and standard professionals have developed consensus-based protocols for safe delivery, handling, and use of hydrogen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates October 8, 2017, as “National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 288—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 1 THROUGH 7, 2017, AS “NATIONAL COMMUNITY POLICING WEEK”

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 288

Whereas police officers are indispensable members of the community who put their lives on the line to protect others;

Whereas promoting strong relationships founded in trust and mutual respect between law enforcement officers and the communities they serve helps ensure the safe and effective execution of the law;

Whereas law enforcement officers and communities that work together to address public safety concerns can create lasting solutions to difficult challenges;

Whereas a long-term commitment to community policing is necessary to eliminate the underlying causes of crime;

Whereas the advancement of community policing should be supported to ensure that State and local law enforcement agencies have necessary resources; and

Whereas community policing has been recognized as an important tool for improving the relationship between law enforcement officers and the communities they serve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 1 through 7, 2017, as “National Community Policing Week”; and

(2) supports community policing and encourages the people of the United States, law enforcement agencies, and elected officials to identify ways in which communities may improve public safety, strengthen relationships, and build trust.

SENATE RESOLUTION 289—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING OCTOBER 8, 2017, AS “NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE WEEK”

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 289

Whereas, in 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt established the first national wildlife refuge on Pelican Island in Florida;

Whereas, in 2017, the National Wildlife Refuge System, administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, is the premier system of land and water to conserve wildlife in the world and has grown to approximately 836,000,000 acres, 566 national wildlife refuges, and 38 wetland management districts located in every State and territory of the United States;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important recreational and tourism destinations in communities across the United States and this protected land offers a variety of recreational opportunities, including 6 wildlife-dependent uses that the National Wildlife Refuge System manages, specifically hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

Whereas, in 2017, 373 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have hunting programs and 310 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have fishing programs, averaging more than 2,400,000 hunting visits and nearly 6,900,000 fishing visits each year;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System experienced more than 31,400,000 wildlife observation visits during fiscal year 2016;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important to local businesses and gateway communities;

Whereas visitation to the National Wildlife Refuge System increased by nearly 30 percent from 2006 to 2016;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System experiences more than 50,000,000 visits

each year, which generate more than \$2,400,000,000 in sales and 35,000 jobs in local economies;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System encompasses every kind of ecosystem in the United States, including temperate, tropical and boreal forests, wetlands, deserts, grasslands, arctic tundras, and remote islands, and spans 12 time zones from the Virgin Islands to Guam;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are home to more than 700 species of birds, 220 species of mammals, 250 species of reptiles and amphibians, and more than 1,000 species of fish;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are the primary Federal lands on which the production, migration, and wintering habitat for waterfowl are fostered;

Whereas, since 1934, the sale of the Federal Duck Stamp to outdoor enthusiasts has generated more than \$850,000,000 in funds, which has enabled the purchase or lease of more than 5,700,000 acres of habitat for waterfowl and numerous other species in the National Wildlife Refuge System;

Whereas refuges provide protection to more than 380 threatened and endangered species;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are cores of conservation for larger landscapes and resources for other agencies of the Federal Government, State governments, private landowners, and organizations in efforts to secure the wildlife heritage of the United States;

Whereas more than 40,000 volunteers and approximately 200 national wildlife refuge “Friends” organizations contribute more than 1,350,000 volunteer hours annually, the equivalent of nearly 650 full-time employees, and provide an important link to local communities;

Whereas national wildlife refuges provide an important opportunity for children to discover and gain a greater appreciation for the natural world;

Whereas there are national wildlife refuges located in several urban and suburban areas and there is a refuge located within a 1 hour drive of every metropolitan area in the United States, which has enabled national wildlife refuges to employ, educate, and engage young people from all backgrounds in exploring, connecting with, and preserving the natural heritage of the United States;

Whereas, since 1995, refuges across the United States have held festivals, educational programs, guided tours, and other events to celebrate National Wildlife Refuge Week during the second full week of October;

Whereas the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has designated the week beginning on October 8, 2017, as “National Wildlife Refuge Week”; and

Whereas the designation of National Wildlife Refuge Week by the Senate would recognize more than a century of conservation in the United States, raise awareness about the importance of wildlife and the National Wildlife Refuge System, and celebrate the myriad recreational opportunities available to enjoy this network of protected lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning on October 8, 2017, as “National Wildlife Refuge Week”;

(2) encourages the observance of National Wildlife Refuge Week with appropriate events and activities;

(3) acknowledges the importance of national wildlife refuges for their recreational opportunities and contribution to local economies across the United States;

(4) finds that national wildlife refuges play a vital role in securing the hunting and fishing heritage of the United States for future generations;

(5) identifies the significance of national wildlife refuges in advancing the traditions of wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

(6) recognizes the importance of national wildlife refuges to wildlife conservation, the protection of imperiled species and ecosystems, and compatible uses;

(7) acknowledges the role of national wildlife refuges in conserving waterfowl and waterfowl habitat under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(8) reaffirms the support of the Senate for wildlife conservation and the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(9) expresses the intent of the Senate—
(A) to continue working to conserve wildlife; and

(B) to manage the National Wildlife Refuge System for current and future generations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 290—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 5, 2017, AS “ENERGY EFFICIENCY DAY” IN CELEBRATION OF THE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS THAT HAVE BEEN DRIVEN BY PRIVATE SECTOR INNOVATION AND FEDERAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY POLICIES PUT IN PLACE OVER THE PAST 4 DECADES

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. REED, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 290

Whereas October has been designated as “National Energy Awareness Month”;

Whereas improvements in energy efficiency technologies and practices along with policies of the United States enacted since the 1970s have resulted in energy savings of more than 60,000,000,000,000 British thermal units and energy cost avoidance of more than \$800,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas energy efficiency has enjoyed bipartisan support in Congress and in administrations of both parties for more than 40 years;

Whereas bipartisan legislation enacted since the 1970s to advance Federal energy efficiency policies includes—

(1) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.);

(2) the National Appliance Energy Conservation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-12; 101 Stat. 103);

(3) the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 et seq.);

(4) the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.);

(5) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17001 et seq.); and

(6) the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-11; 129 Stat. 182);

Whereas energy efficiency has long been supported by a diverse coalition of businesses (including manufacturers, utilities, energy service companies, and technology firms), public-interest organizations, environmental and conservation groups, and State and local governments;

Whereas, since 1980, the United States has more than doubled its energy productivity, realizing twice the economic output per unit of energy consumed;

Whereas more than 2,200,000 individuals in the United States are currently employed across the energy efficiency sector, as the United States has doubled its energy productivity and business and industry have become more innovative and competitive in global markets;

Whereas the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy of the Department of Energy is the principal Federal agency responsible for renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency efforts;

Whereas cutting energy waste saves the consumers of the United States billions of dollars on utility bills annually; and

Whereas energy efficiency policies, financing innovations, and public-private partnerships have contributed to a reduction in energy intensity in Federal facilities and vehicle fleets by over 47 percent since the mid-1970s, which results in direct savings to United States taxpayers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 5, 2017, as “Energy Efficiency Day”; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe Energy Efficiency Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1110. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PERDUE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SASSE, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MANCHIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1595, to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1110. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PERDUE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SASSE, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MANCHIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1595, to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PREVENTION OF ACCESS BY HIZBALLAH TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Sec. 101. Mandatory sanctions with respect to fundraising and recruitment activities for Hizballah.

Sec. 102. Modification of report with respect to financial institutions that engage in certain transactions.

Sec. 103. Sanctions against agencies and instrumentalities of foreign states that support Hizballah.

TITLE II—NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH

Sec. 201. Blocking of property of Hizballah.

Sec. 202. Report on racketeering activities engaged in by Hizballah.

Sec. 203. Modification of report on activities of foreign governments to disrupt global logistics networks and fundraising, financing, and money laundering activities of Hizballah.

Sec. 204. Report on combating the illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Regulatory authority.

Sec. 302. Exceptions.

TITLE I—PREVENTION OF ACCESS BY HIZBALLAH TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 101. MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FUNDRAISING AND RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES FOR HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“**SEC. 101. MANDATORY SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FUNDRAISING AND RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES FOR HIZBALLAH.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any foreign person that the President determines knowingly provides significant financial, material, or technological support for—

“(1) Bayt al-Mal, Jihad al-Bina, the Islamic Resistance Support Association, or any successor or affiliate thereof as designated by the President;

“(2) al-Manar TV, al Nour Radio, or the Lebanese Media Group, or any successor or affiliate thereof as designated by the President;

“(3) a foreign person determined by the President to be engaged in fundraising or recruitment activities for Hizballah; or

“(4) a foreign person owned or controlled by a foreign person described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

“(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (except that the requirements of section 202 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a foreign person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(B) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

“(i) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien who the President determines is subject to subsection (a) is—

“(I) inadmissible to the United States;

“(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

“(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

“(ii) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien who the President determines is subject to subsection (a), regardless of when issued.

“(II) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under subclause (I) shall take effect immediately and shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the possession of the alien.

“(2) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under paragraph (1)(A) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

“(d) PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a finding under this section, or a prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding, is based on classified information (as defined in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.)) and a court reviews the finding or the imposition of the prohibition, condition, or penalty, the President may submit such information to the court ex parte and in camera.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to confer or imply any right to judicial review of any finding under this section or any prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding.

“(e) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the imposition of sanctions under this section if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

“(2) BRIEFING.—Not later than 30 days after the issuance of a waiver under paragraph (1) with respect to a foreign person, and every 180 days thereafter while the waiver remains in effect, the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the involvement of the foreign person in activities described in subsection (a).

“(f) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and every 180 days thereafter for the following 5 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that lists the foreign persons that the President determines are described in subsection (a).

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms ‘admitted’ and ‘alien’ have meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

“(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

“(3) ENTITY.—The term ‘entity’ means a partnership, association, corporation, or other organization, group, or subgroup.

“(4) HIZBALLAH.—The term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given such term in section 102(f).

“(5) PERSON.—The term ‘person’ means an individual or entity.

“(6) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ means a United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States (including foreign branches), or a person in the United States.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended by striking the item relating to section 101 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 101. Mandatory sanctions with respect to fundraising and recruitment activities for Hizballah.”.

SEC. 102. MODIFICATION OF REPORT WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

Subsection (d) of section 102 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) REPORT ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ORGANIZED UNDER THE LAWS OF STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and every 180 days thereafter for the following 5 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

“(A) identifies each foreign financial institution described in paragraph (2) that the President determines engages in one or more activities described in subsection (a)(2);

“(B) provides a detailed description of each such activity; and

“(C) contains a determination with respect to each such foreign financial institution that is identified under subparagraph (A) as engaging in one or more activities described in subsection (a)(2) as to whether such foreign financial institution is in violation of Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism) by reason of engaging in one or more such activities.

“(2) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION DESCRIBED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign financial institution described in this paragraph is a foreign financial institution—

“(i) that, wherever located, is—

“(I) organized under the laws of a state sponsor of terrorism or any jurisdiction within a state sponsor of terrorism;

“(II) owned or controlled by the government of a state sponsor of terrorism;

“(III) located in the territory of a state sponsor of terrorism; or

“(IV) owned or controlled by a foreign financial institution described in subclause (I), (II), or (III); and

“(ii) the capitalization of which exceeds \$10,000,000.

“(B) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—In this paragraph, the term ‘state sponsor of ter-

rorism’ means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined is a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism for purposes of—

“(i) section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605(j)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.));

“(ii) section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

“(iii) section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780); or

“(iv) any other provision of law.”.

SEC. 103. SANCTIONS AGAINST AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF FOREIGN STATES THAT SUPPORT HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 103. SANCTIONS AGAINST AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF FOREIGN STATES THAT SUPPORT HIZBALLAH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and as appropriate thereafter, the President shall block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any agency or instrumentality of a foreign state described in subsection (b) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(b) AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY OF A FOREIGN STATE DESCRIBED.—An agency or instrumentality of a foreign state described in this subsection is an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state that the President determines knowingly provides significant financial, material, or technological support for, goods or services to or in support of, or arms or related material to—

“(1) Hizballah;

“(2) an entity owned or controlled by Hizballah; or

“(3) an entity that the President determines has acted for or on behalf of Hizballah.

“(c) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under subsection (a) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

“(e) PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a finding under this section, or a prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding, is based on classified information (as defined in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.)) and a court reviews the finding or the imposition of the prohibition, condition, or penalty, the President may submit such information to the court ex parte and in camera.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to confer or imply any right to judicial review of any finding under this section or any prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding.

“(f) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the imposition of sanctions under this section with

respect to an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

“(2) BRIEFING.—Not later than 30 days after the issuance of a waiver under paragraph (1) with respect to an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, and every 180 days thereafter while the waiver remains in effect, the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the involvement of the agency or instrumentality in activities described in subsection (b).

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY OF A FOREIGN STATE; FOREIGN STATE.—The terms ‘agency or instrumentality of a foreign state’ and ‘foreign state’ have the meanings given those terms in section 1603 of title 28, United States Code.

“(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

“(3) ARMS OR RELATED MATERIAL.—The term ‘arms or related material’ means—

“(A) nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological weapons or materials or components of such weapons;

“(B) ballistic or cruise missile weapons or materials or components of such weapons;

“(C) destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons;

“(D) defense articles or defense services, as those terms are defined in paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, of section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794);

“(E) defense information, as that term is defined in section 644 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2403); or

“(F) items designated by the President for purposes of the United States Munitions List under section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)).

“(4) HIZBALLAH.—The term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given that term in section 102(f).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 102 the following new item:

“Sec. 103. Sanctions against agencies and instrumentalities of foreign states that support Hizballah.”

TITLE II—NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH

SEC. 201. BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 201. BLOCKING OF PROPERTY OF HIZBALLAH.

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that Hizballah conducts narcotics trafficking and significant transnational criminal activities.

“(b) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and as appropriate thereafter, the President shall block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of Hizballah if such property and interests in

property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(c) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under subsection (b) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

“(e) PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a finding under this section, or a prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding, is based on classified information (as defined in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.)) and a court reviews the finding or the imposition of the prohibition, condition, or penalty, the President may submit such information to the court *ex parte* and in camera.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to confer or imply any right to judicial review of any finding under this section or any prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding.

“(f) WAIVER.—The President may, for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the imposition of sanctions under this section if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

“(g) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given that term in section 102(f).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to title II and inserting the following:

“TITLE II—IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HIZBALLAH AND REPORTS RELATING TO NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND SIGNIFICANT TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH.”; AND

(2) by striking the item relating to section 201 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 201. Blocking of property of Hizballah.”

SEC. 202. REPORT ON RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 202. REPORT ON RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY HIZBALLAH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the following:

“(1) Activities that Hizballah, and agents and affiliates of Hizballah, have engaged in that are racketeering activities.

“(2) The extent to which Hizballah, and agents and affiliates of Hizballah, engage in a pattern of such racketeering activities.

“(b) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

“(2) HIZBALLAH.—The term ‘Hizballah’ has the meaning given that term in section 102(f).

“(3) RACKETEERING ACTIVITY.—The term ‘racketeering activity’ has the meaning given that term in section 1961(1) of title 18, United States Code.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 is amended by striking the item relating to section 202 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 202. Report on racketeering activities engaged in by Hizballah.”

SEC. 203. MODIFICATION OF REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO DISRUPT GLOBAL LOGISTICS NETWORKS AND FUNDRAISING, FINANCING, AND MONEY LAUNDERING ACTIVITIES OF HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 204 of the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–102; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years”;

(B) in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and free-trade zones.” and inserting “free-trade zones, business partnerships and joint ventures, and other investments in small and medium-sized enterprises.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) a list of jurisdictions outside of Lebanon that expressly consent to, or with knowledge allow, the use of their territory by Hizballah to carry out terrorist activities, including training, financing, and recruitment;

“(G) a description of the total aggregate revenues and remittances that Hizballah receives from the global logistics networks of Hizballah.”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) ENHANCED DUE DILIGENCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall prescribe, as necessary, enhanced due diligence policies, procedures, and controls for United States financial institutions, and foreign financial institutions maintaining correspondent accounts or payable-through accounts with United States financial institutions, that the President determines provide significant financial services for persons and entities operating in a jurisdiction included in the list required under subsection (a)(1)(F) if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ‘correspondent account’ and ‘payable-through account’ have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.”; and

(4) in subsection (c), as redesignated by paragraph (2) by adding before the period at

the end the following: “and on any requirements for enhanced due diligence prescribed under subsection (b)”.

(b) REPORT ON ESTIMATED NET WORTH OF SENIOR HIZBALLAH MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter for the following 2 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains—

(A) the estimated total net worth of each individual described in paragraph (2); and

(B) a description of how funds of each individual described in paragraph (2) were acquired, and how such funds have been used or employed.

(2) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—The individuals described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Secretary General of Hizballah.

(B) Any other individual that the President determines is a senior foreign political figure of Hizballah.

(3) FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

(A) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The unclassified portion of the report required under paragraph (1) shall be made available to the public in precompressed, easily downloadable versions that are made available in all appropriate formats.

(4) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the President may use any credible publication, database, or web-based resource, and any credible information compiled by any government agency, nongovernmental organization, or other entity provided to or made available to the President.

(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(B) FUNDS.—The term “funds” means—

(i) cash;

(ii) equity;

(iii) any other intangible asset the value of which is derived from a contractual claim, including bank deposits, bonds, stocks, a security (as defined in section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a))), or a security or an equity security (as those terms are defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))); and

(iv) anything else of value that the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be appropriate.

(C) SENIOR FOREIGN POLITICAL FIGURE.—The term “senior foreign political figure” has the meaning given that term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

SEC. 204. REPORT ON COMBATING THE ILLICIT TOBACCO TRAFFICKING NETWORKS USED BY HIZBALLAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on combating the illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah to finance their operations, as described in the report submitted to Congress in December 2015 by the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Health and Human Services entitled, “The Global Illicit Trade in Tobacco: A Threat to National Security.”

(b) MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the steps to be taken by Federal agencies to combat the illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah.

(2) A description of the steps to be taken to engage State and local law enforcement authorities in efforts to combat illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah operating within the United States.

(3) A description of the steps to be taken to engage foreign government law enforcement and intelligence authorities in efforts to combat illicit tobacco trafficking networks used by Hizballah operating outside the United States.

(4) Recommendations for legislative or administrative action, as appropriate, to address the threat of illicit tobacco trafficking networks.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, prescribe regulations as necessary for the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 10 days before the prescription of regulations under subsection (a), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees regarding the proposed regulations and the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act that the regulations are implementing.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 302. EXCEPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply to the following:

(1) Any authorized intelligence, law enforcement, or national security activities of the United States.

(2) Any transaction necessary to comply with United States obligations under—

(A) the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947;

(B) the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967; or

(C) any other international treaty.

(b) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions under this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not in-

clude the authority or requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 8 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in room SR-328A to hold a hearing on the following nominations: Gregory Ibach, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Regulator Programs; William Northey, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm and Foreign Agriculture Services.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 to hold a hearing on the nomination of Paul Trombino III, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 to hold a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., to hold a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., to hold a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 to hold a hearing entitled “The Federal Response to the Opioid Crisis.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 to hold an executive business meeting.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday,

October 5, 2017, at 2 p.m., in room SH-219 to hold a closed hearing.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FLEXIBILITY ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 109, S. 692.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 692) to provide for integrated plan permits, to establish an Office of the Municipal Ombudsman, to promote green infrastructure, and to require the revision of financial capability guidance.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Water Infrastructure Flexibility Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF ADMINISTRATOR.

In this Act, the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SEC. 3. INTEGRATED PLANS.

(a) INTEGRATED PLANS.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) INTEGRATED PLAN PERMITS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ‘green infrastructure’ means the range of measures that use plant or soil systems, permeable pavement or other permeable surfaces or substrates, stormwater harvest and reuse, or landscaping to store, infiltrate, or evapotranspire stormwater and reduce flows to sewer systems or to surface waters.

“(B) INTEGRATED PLAN.—The term ‘integrated plan’ has the meaning given in Part III of the Integrated Municipal Stormwater and Wastewater Planning Approach Framework, issued by the Environmental Protection Agency and dated June 5, 2012.

“(C) MUNICIPAL DISCHARGE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘municipal discharge’ means a discharge from a treatment works (as defined in section 212) or a discharge from a municipal storm sewer under subsection (p).

“(ii) INCLUSION.—The term ‘municipal discharge’ includes a discharge of wastewater or storm water collected from multiple municipalities if the discharge is covered by the same permit issued under this section.

“(2) INTEGRATED PLAN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator (or a State, in the case of a permit program approved under subsection (b)) shall inform a municipal permittee or multiple municipal permittees of the opportunity to develop an integrated plan.

“(B) SCOPE OF PERMIT INCORPORATING INTEGRATED PLAN.—A permit issued under this subsection that incorporates an integrated plan may integrate all requirements under this Act addressed in the integrated plan, including requirements relating to—

“(i) a combined sewer overflow;

“(ii) a capacity, management, operation, and maintenance program for sanitary sewer collection systems;

“(iii) a municipal stormwater discharge;

“(iv) a municipal wastewater discharge; and

“(v) a water quality-based effluent limitation to implement an applicable wasteload allocation in a total maximum daily load.

“(3) COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A permit for a municipal discharge by a municipality that incorporates an integrated plan may include a schedule of compliance, under which actions taken to meet any applicable water quality-based effluent limitation may be implemented over more than 1 permit term if the compliance schedules are authorized by State water quality standards.

“(B) INCLUSION.—Actions subject to a compliance schedule under subparagraph (A) may include green infrastructure if implemented as part of a water quality-based effluent limitation.

“(C) REVIEW.—A schedule of compliance may be reviewed each time the permit is renewed.

“(4) EXISTING AUTHORITIES RETAINED.—

“(A) APPLICABLE STANDARDS.—Nothing in this subsection modifies any obligation to comply with applicable technology and water quality-based effluent limitations under this Act.

“(B) FLEXIBILITY.—Nothing in this subsection reduces or eliminates any flexibility available under this Act, including the authority of—

“(i) a State to revise a water quality standard after a use attainability analysis under section 131.10(g) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), subject to the approval of the Administrator under section 303(c); and

“(ii) the Administrator or a State to authorize a schedule of compliance that extends beyond the date of expiration of a permit term if the schedule of compliance meets the requirements of section 122.47 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection).

“(5) CLARIFICATION OF STATE AUTHORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in section 301(b)(1)(C) precludes a State from authorizing in the water quality standards of the State the issuance of a schedule of compliance to meet water quality-based effluent limitations in permits that incorporate provisions of an integrated plan.

“(B) TRANSITION RULE.—In any case in which a discharge is subject to a judicial order or consent decree as of the date of enactment of the Water Infrastructure Flexibility Act resolving an enforcement action under this Act, any schedule of compliance issued pursuant to an authorization in a State water quality standard shall not revise a schedule of compliance in that order or decree unless the order or decree is modified by agreement of the parties and the court.”

(b) MUNICIPAL OMBUDSMAN.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Office of the Administrator an Office of the Municipal Ombudsman.

(2) GENERAL DUTIES.—The duties of the municipal ombudsman shall include the provision of—

(A) technical assistance to municipalities seeking to comply with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.); and

(B) information to the Administrator to help the Administrator ensure that agency policies are implemented by all offices of the Environmental Protection Agency, including regional offices.

(3) ACTIONS REQUIRED.—The municipal ombudsman shall work with appropriate offices at the headquarters and regional offices of the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that the municipality seeking assistance is provided information—

(A) about available Federal financial assistance for which the municipality is eligible;

(B) about flexibility available under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and, if applicable, the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.); and

(C) regarding the opportunity to develop an integrated plan, as defined in section 402(s)(1)(B) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as added by subsection (a)).

(4) INFORMATION SHARING.—The municipal ombudsman shall publish on the website of the Environmental Protection Agency—

(A) general information relating to—

(i) the technical assistance referred to in paragraph (2)(A);

(ii) the financial assistance referred to in paragraph (3)(A);

(iii) the flexibility referred to in paragraph 3(B); and

(iv) any resources related to integrated plans developed by the Administrator; and

(B) a copy of each permit, order, or judicial consent decree that implements or incorporates an integrated plan.

(c) MUNICIPAL ENFORCEMENT.—Section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1319) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED PLANS THROUGH ENFORCEMENT TOOLS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In conjunction with an enforcement action under subsection (a) or (b) relating to municipal discharges, the Administrator shall inform a municipality of the opportunity to develop an integrated plan, as defined in section 402(s).

“(2) MODIFICATION.—Any municipality under an administrative order under subsection (a) or settlement agreement (including a judicial consent decree) under subsection (b) that has developed an integrated plan consistent with section 402(s) may request a modification of the administrative order or settlement agreement based on that integrated plan.”

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and make publicly available a report on each integrated plan developed and implemented through a permit, order, or judicial consent decree since the date of publication of the “Integrated Municipal Stormwater and Wastewater Planning Approach Framework” issued by the Environmental Protection Agency and dated June 5, 2012, including a description of the control measures, levels of control, estimated costs, and compliance schedules for the requirements implemented through an integrated plan.

SEC. 4. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROMOTION.

Title V of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 519 (33 U.S.C. 1251 note) as section 520; and

(2) by inserting after section 518 (33 U.S.C. 1377) the following:

“SEC. 519. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROMOTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall ensure that the Office of Water, the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, the Office of Research and Development, and the Office of Policy of the Environmental Protection Agency promote the use of green infrastructure in and coordinate the integration of green infrastructure into, permitting programs, planning efforts, research, technical assistance, and funding guidance.

“(b) DUTIES.—The Administrator shall ensure that the Office of Water—

“(1) promotes the use of green infrastructure in the programs of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

“(2) coordinates efforts to increase the use of green infrastructure with—

“(A) other Federal departments and agencies;

“(B) State, tribal, and local governments; and

“(C) the private sector.

“(c) REGIONAL GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROMOTION.—The Administrator shall direct each regional office of the Environmental Protection Agency, as appropriate based on local factors, and consistent with the requirements of this

Act, to promote and integrate the use of green infrastructure within the region that includes—

“(1) outreach and training regarding green infrastructure implementation for State, tribal, and local governments, tribal communities, and the private sector; and

“(2) the incorporation of green infrastructure into permitting and other regulatory programs, codes, and ordinance development, including the requirements under consent decrees and settlement agreements in enforcement actions.

“(d) GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION SHARING.—The Administrator shall promote green infrastructure information sharing, including through an Internet website, to share information with, and provide technical assistance to, State, tribal, and local governments, tribal communities, the private sector, and the public regarding green infrastructure approaches for—

“(1) reducing water pollution;

“(2) protecting water resources;

“(3) complying with regulatory requirements; and

“(4) achieving other environmental, public health, and community goals.”.

SEC. 5. FINANCIAL CAPABILITY GUIDANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AFFORDABILITY.—The term “affordability” means, with respect to payment of a utility bill, a measure of whether an individual customer or household can pay the bill without undue hardship or unreasonable sacrifice in the essential lifestyle or spending patterns of the individual or household, as determined by the Administrator.

(2) FINANCIAL CAPABILITY.—The term “financial capability” means the financial capability of a community to make investments necessary to make water quality or drinking water improvements.

(3) GUIDANCE.—The term “guidance” means the guidance published by the Administrator entitled “Combined Sewer Overflows—Guidance for Financial Capability Assessment and Schedule Development” and dated February 1997, as applicable to the combined sewer overflows and sanitary sewer overflows guidance published by the Administrator entitled “Financial Capability Assessment Framework” and dated November 24, 2014.

(b) USE OF MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME.—The Administrator shall not use median household income as the sole indicator of affordability for a residential household.

(c) REVISED GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of completion of the National Academy of Public Administration study to establish a definition and framework for community affordability required by Senate Report 114-70, accompanying S. 1645 (114th Congress), the Administrator shall revise the guidance described in subsection (a)(3).

(2) USE OF GUIDANCE.—Beginning on the date on which the revised guidance referred to in paragraph (1) is finalized, the Administrator shall use the revised guidance in lieu of the guidance described in subsection (a)(3).

(d) CONSIDERATION AND CONSULTATION.—

(1) CONSIDERATION.—In revising the guidance, the Administrator shall consider—

(A) the recommendations of the study referred to in subsection (c) and any other relevant study, as determined by the Administrator;

(B) local economic conditions, including site-specific local conditions that should be taken into consideration in analyzing financial capability;

(C) other essential community investments;

(D) potential adverse impacts on distressed populations, including the percentage of low-income ratepayers within the service area of a utility and impacts in communities with disparate economic conditions throughout the entire service area of a utility;

(E) the degree to which rates of low-income consumers would be affected by water infra-

structure investments, the use of rate structures, and customer assistance programs to address the rates of low-income consumers;

(F) an evaluation of an array of factors, the relative importance of which may vary across regions and localities; and

(G) the appropriate weight for economic, public health, and environmental benefits.

(2) CONSULTATION.—Any revised guidance issued to replace the guidance shall be developed in consultation with stakeholders.

(e) PUBLICATION AND SUBMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On completion of the revision of the guidance, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives the revised guidance.

(2) EXPLANATION.—If the Administrator makes a determination not to follow one or more recommendations of the study referred to in subsection (c)(1), the Administrator shall include in the publication and submission under paragraph (1) an explanation of that decision.

(f) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section preempts or interferes with any obligation to comply with any Federal law, including the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 692), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 221, S. 1103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1103) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department-wide guidance and to develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1103) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1103

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 “Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. ENHANCED DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY COORDINATION THROUGH THE BLUE CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 434. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘human trafficking’ means an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Department a program, which shall be known as the ‘Blue Campaign’. The Blue Campaign shall be headed by a Director, who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

“(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Blue Campaign shall be to unify and coordinate Department efforts to address human trafficking.

“(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary, working through the Director, shall, in accordance with subsection (e)—

“(1) issue Department-wide guidance to appropriate Department personnel;

“(2) develop training programs for such personnel; and

“(3) coordinate departmental efforts, including training for such personnel.

“(e) GUIDANCE AND TRAINING.—The Blue Campaign shall provide guidance and training to appropriate Department personnel and other Federal, State, tribal, and law enforcement personnel, as appropriate regarding—

“(1) programs to help identify instances of human trafficking;

“(2) the types of information that should be collected and recorded in information technology systems utilized by the Department to help identify individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking;

“(3) systematic and routine information sharing within the Department and among Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies regarding—

“(A) individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking; and

“(B) patterns and practices of human trafficking;

“(4) techniques to identify suspected victims of trafficking along the United States border and at airport security checkpoints;

“(5) methods to be used by the Transportation Security Administration and personnel from other appropriate agencies—

“(A) to train employees of the Transportation Security Administration to identify suspected victims of trafficking; and

“(B) to serve as a liaison and resource regarding human trafficking prevention to appropriate State, local, and private sector aviation workers and the traveling public;

“(6) utilizing resources, such as indicator cards, fact sheets, pamphlets, posters, brochures, and radio and television campaigns—

“(A) to educate partners and stakeholders; and

“(B) to increase public awareness of human trafficking;

“(7) leveraging partnerships with State and local governmental, nongovernmental, and private sector organizations to raise public awareness of human trafficking; and

“(8) any other activities the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the Blue Campaign.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 433 the following:

“Sec. 434. Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign.”.

SEC. 3. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure, in accordance with the Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance required under section 434(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2, the integration of information technology systems utilized within the Department to record and track information regarding individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that—

(1) describes the status and effectiveness of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign; and

(2) provides a recommendation regarding the appropriate office within the Department of Homeland Security for the Blue Campaign.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated \$819,000 to carry out section 434 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2.

HIZBALLAH INTERNATIONAL FINANCING PREVENTION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1595 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1595) to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rubio substitute amendment be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 1110) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The bill (S. 1595), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consid-

eration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 287, S. Res. 288, S. Res. 289, and S. Res. 290.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

REPORTING AUTHORITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the Senate's adjournment, committees be authorized to report legislative and executive matters on Friday, October 13, from 9 a.m. until 11 a.m.

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

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2017, THROUGH MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, October 6, at 10:30 a.m.; Tuesday, October 10, at 9:15 a.m.; and Friday, October 13, at 8:30 a.m.

I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, October 13, it next convene at 4 p.m. on Monday, October 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Gingrich nomination, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 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 5:51 p.m., adjourned until Friday, October 6, 2017, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

R. D. JAMES, OF MISSOURI, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE JO-ELLEN DARCY.
BRUCE D. JETTE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE HEIDI SHYU, RESIGNED.
SHON J. MANASCO, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE GABRIEL CAMARILLO.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DAVID J. RYDER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE MINT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE EDMUND C. MOY, RESIGNED.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEON A. WESTMORELAND, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ANDREW WHEELER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE ROBERT PERCIASEPE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LISA A. JOHNSON, OF WASHINGTON, 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 REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

KATE S. O'SCANNLAIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SOLICITOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, VICE M. PATRICIA SMITH, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MITCHELL ZAIS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, VICE JAMES H. SHELTON III, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FRANK M. COFFMAN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PATRICK J. WILKERSON, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

KURT D. ENGELHARDT, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, VICE EDITH BROWN CLEMENT, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

THOMAS M. GRIFFIN, JR., OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KELVIN CORNELIUS WASHINGTON, TERM EXPIRED.

MARK S. JAMES, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ALFRED COOPER LOMAX, TERM EXPIRED.

JOHNNY LEE KUHLMAN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CHARLES THOMAS WEEKS II, TERM EXPIRED.

DANIEL C. MOSTELLER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PAUL CHARLES THIELEN, TERM EXPIRED.

GARY G. SCHOFIELD, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CHRISTOPHER TOBIAS HOYE, TERM EXPIRED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 5, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

LEE FRANCIS CISSNA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2004.

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE VICE CHAIRMAN FOR SUPERVISION OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STEPHEN B. KING, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CZECH REPUBLIC.

BARBARA LEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SEVENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

CHRISTOPHER SMITH, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO

THE SEVENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

J. STEVEN DOWD, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DIRECTOR OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

BRUCE J. WALKER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TIMOTHY GALLAUDET, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

HOWARD R. ELLIOTT, OF INDIANA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

WALTER G. COPAN, OF COLORADO, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING SHELBY O'NEIL

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Shelby O'Neil, a dedicated constituent of the 20th Congressional District. At just sixteen years of age, Shelby has found a passion for environmentalism that she has channeled in ways that are truly exceptional.

In my district on the central coast of California, we understand the importance of conservation and respect for the natural environment we all enjoy. Among the many parks and recreation areas in the 20th district, our crown jewel is the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. This pristine stretch of coastline, while enjoyed in many ways by residents and tourists alike, also stands as an enduring responsibility to the residents of the Central Coast to ensure its protection. Protected lands such as the sanctuary in our backyard are living postcards that we pass to future generations. It is up to those future generations to shoulder that burden and rise to the responsibilities. Shelby has answered this call, and has risen to this challenge in truly impressive ways.

Shelby has demonstrated sincere dedication to the cause of reducing ocean pollution and has built a framework with which to engage her peers, neighbors, and businesses in protecting our local environment. She came to develop a passion for this cause by volunteering at the Monterey Bay Aquarium, a world-renowned institution of marine biological research. During her time as a volunteer, Shelby quickly learned about the threat that pollution poses to the ocean. Determined to take action, Shelby founded her own nonprofit organization, the Junior Ocean Guardians. Under Shelby's leadership, the Junior Ocean Guardians have planned several beach clean-up efforts and done classroom presentations at schools around the Central Coast to raise awareness and build support for the organization's mission of protecting our oceans.

In addition, the Junior Ocean Guardians are championing a new initiative called "No Straw November." In my home state of California, a permanent ban has been issued on plastic bags due to the unnecessary pollution they cause in our oceans. However, there is still much work to be done in reducing other sources of plastic pollution. That is why I am so impressed with the Junior Ocean Guardians, who have taken on the goal of ending the use of single use plastic straws, which pose a serious risk to our diverse marine ecosystems on the coast of California. No Straw November represents an effort to raise the public's awareness of the importance of plastic pollution by challenging participants to go an entire month without using a single use plastic straw. While there is much work to be done in the halls of Congress to address environmental pollution, real change begins by chang-

ing our habits and behaviors. By challenging her community to make the small sacrifices necessary to sustain the beautiful natural habits we all enjoy, Shelby is performing a vital civic duty, and her efforts set her apart as an example for her peers.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to add my name to the recognition of Shelby's accomplishments, and wish her the best in her future endeavors. I encourage all of my colleagues in the House to show their support by joining me in taking the No Straw November challenge.

IN RECOGNITION OF LUZERNE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Luzerne County Community College, which is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. LCCC was founded in 1966 by the Luzerne County Board of Commissioners as a public, two-year college to provide affordable, accessible education for residents of Northeastern Pennsylvania and first began educating students in 1967.

When the College opened in 1967, Northeastern Pennsylvania was facing a pivotal moment in its history as the regional economy shifted away from coal industry jobs. The College responded to the demand for qualified, educated individuals to meet the needs of the area's rapidly changing industrial framework. From a two-building location in Wilkes-Barre, LCCC moved to its permanent, 122-acre location in Nanticoke in 1974. In the early 2000s, LCCC began expanding its reach beyond its Nanticoke Campus to include Hazelton, Berwick, Elk Lake, and its newest location in downtown Scranton.

Today, Luzerne County Community College offers associate degree, certificate, and diploma programs to over 5,000 students annually. The community college option provides affordable college education to a diverse student body from recent high school graduates to adult learners who are returning to the classroom for the first time since high school. LCCC offers programs in Nursing, Criminal Justice, Business Administration, and Computer Information Systems.

For many students, their education does not end with Luzerne County Community College. Many choose to continue their education at one of over 40 baccalaureate degree-awarding institutions with which LCCC has matriculation or transfer agreements. Many students in Northeastern Pennsylvania are set on a pathway toward success that begins with a strong educational groundwork from LCCC.

The College is committed to remaining at the forefront in affordable, accessible education in the Wyoming Valley and continues to adapt and respond to meet the needs of the

area's growing and changing educational, economic, and industrial needs.

IN HONOR OF REVEREND ELIJAH SMITH, SR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated man of God, community servant, Civil Rights Leader, family man and friend of longstanding, Rev. Elijah Smith, Sr. Sadly, Rev. Smith passed away on October 2, 2017. His funeral service will be held on Saturday, October 7, 2017 at 1 p.m. at the St. Peter A.M.E. Church in Fort Valley, Georgia.

Reverend Elijah Smith, Sr. was born on December 28, 1939, in Fort Valley, Georgia, to the union of the late Mr. Samuel L. Smith and the late Mrs. Ola M. Johnson Smith. He was educated in the Peach County School System.

On October 11, 1964, Reverend Smith received a calling that would change his life forever—he was called to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He acknowledged this calling at the Allen Chapel A.M.E. Church in Peach County. His first pastoral appointment occurred in 1967 in the Eastman Circuit in Eastman, Georgia. He served in Eastman for four years. He was then assigned to the Allen Chapel and Mountain Creek A.M.E. Churches in Sumter County where he served for a total of 13 years. In 1984, he was assigned to the St. John A.M.E. Church in Columbus, Georgia. During this time, the church was destroyed by a tornado and he was instrumental in the rebuilding of the church at its current location on Steam Mill Road in Columbus. He served at St. John for ten years. Because of his legacy of service and his commitment to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, he was appointed by Bishop Donald George Kenneth Ming as the Presiding Elder of the Eastern District. He was at the time one of three presiding Elders in the Southwest Georgia Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. At the time of his retirement as a Presiding Elder, he was senior Presiding Elder in charge of thirty-six churches. He also retired as a Civil Service Employee at Robins Air Force Base, as an electronic technician. He also was an entrepreneur, as he was the owner of D and S Florist in Fort Valley, Georgia.

Shirley Chisholm once said that, "Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth." Reverend Smith not only paid his rent, as a minister of the gospel, but he paid his rent with his many social and civic affiliations. During his lifetime, he received many awards to include: Joseph Roscoe Campbell Freedom Award for service to the Concerned Citizens Movement for the Americus-Sumter County NAACP; Special Recognition Award for outstanding and dedicated service to the Americus Police Department and the Sumter County Community for

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

his spiritual guidance as chaplain; The Martin Luther King, Jr. Minister's Community Service Award in recognition of outstanding and meritorious service to the church and community from the Columbus; Georgia Chapter of Push; the Sixth Episcopal District (state of Georgia) sons of Allen Award of Support; one of the 50 Most influential African Americans in the Columbus-Ft. Benning and Phenix City Area. He was also a lifetime member of the NAACP, since March of 1996. Reverend Smith served as a past President of the Americus-Sumter Branch of the NAACP. He was always pushing African-Americans to use their political power at the ballot box to effectuate positive social change.

Rev. Elijah Smith loved people and he always fought for what was right. He was guided by his love of God and his love of people. Mother Teresa once said that, "At the end of life we will not be judged by how many diplomas we have received, how much money we have made, how many great things we have done. We will be judged by 'I was hungry, and you gave me something to eat, I was naked and you clothed me. I was homeless, and you took me in.'" Rev. Elijah Smith used his life for good and to help others. He always believed that the "time is always right to do that which is right."

On a personal note, Rev. Smith and his family have been dear friends to my wife Vivian and me for many years, and I will always value the support, encouragement and counsel that he imparted to me over the years.

Rev. Elijah Smith was a great man and accomplished many things in his life, but none of this would have been possible with out the love and support of his family. His legacy lives on through his wife, Janet, his children, step children, grandchildren and all of those that he touched in a special way.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 730 000 constituents of the Second Congressional District of Georgia salute and honor the life of Reverend Elijah Smith, Sr. for his commitment to spreading the Gospel of Jesus Christ for over five decades and serving humankind. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest condolences to Reverend Smith's family during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL JAY SILVERIA, SUPERINTENDENT, U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant General Jay Silveria, the Superintendent of the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado, and include in the RECORD the transcript of his powerful remarks. After five African-American cadet candidates found racial slurs written on the doors of their dorm rooms, Lt. Gen. Silveria gathered the cadets together and forcefully denounced the acts of racism in a speech that has gained national attention, with more than 1.7 million views on Facebook and over 22,000 shares on Twitter.

Our nation was founded on the principles of equality and the inalienable rights of our citizens. Throughout our history Americans like Lt. General Silveria have fought to defend these rights. His remarks are the masterpiece of a true patriot and one we should all remember and be inspired by as we continue to strive for E Pluribus Unum and a more perfect union.

[Full Remarks, 28 September 2017]

(By Lieutenant General Jay Silveria)

Ladies and gentlemen, you may have heard that some people down in the prep school wrote some racial slurs on some message boards. If you haven't heard that, I wanted you to hear it from me. If you're outraged by those words then you're in the right place. That kind of behavior has no place at the prep school, it has no place at USAFA, and it has no place in the US Air Force.

You should be outraged, not only as an airman, but as a human being. And I'll tell you, that the appropriate response for horrible language and horrible ideas, the appropriate response is a better idea. So that's why I'm here. That's why all these people are up here on the staff tower, so let me have everybody who's up here please pull forward to the rails. Also, there's so many people here, they're lining the outsides along the windows. These are members of the faculty, coaching staff, AOC's, AMT's, from the airfield, from my staff, from my headquarters, all aspects of the 10th Airbase Wing, all aspects that make up USAFA and the United States Air Force Academy leadership is here. You heard from Brigadier General Goodwin, Brigadier General Armacost is here, Colonel Block from the athletic department is here, Mr. Knowlton is in Washington, DC right now.

That's why they're here. That's why we're all here, because we have a better idea. Some of you may think that that happened down in the prep school and doesn't apply to us. I would be naive and we would all be naive to think that everything is perfect here. We would be naive to think that we shouldn't discuss this topic. We would also be tone-deaf not to think about the backdrop of what's going on in our country. Things like Charlottesville and Ferguson, the protests in the NFL, that's why we have a better idea. One of those ideas, the Dean brought people together to discuss Charlottesville because what we should have is a civil discourse and talk about these issues, that's a better idea.

We received outstanding feedback from that session at Charlottesville, but I also have a better idea and it's about our diversity, and it's the power of the diversity, the power of the 4,000 of you and all of the people that are on the staff tower and lining the glass, the power of us as a diverse group, the power that we come from all walks of life, that we come from all parts of this country, that we come from all races, we come from all backgrounds, gender, all makeup, all upbringing. The power of that diversity comes together and makes us that much more powerful. That's a much better idea than small thinking and horrible ideas. We have an opportunity here, 5,500 people in this room, to think about what we are as an institution. This is our institution and no one can take away our values. No one can write on a board and question our values. No one can take that away from us.

So just in case you're unclear on where I stand on this topic, I'm going to leave you with my most important thought today: If you can't treat someone with dignity and respect, then you need to get out. If you can't teach someone from another gender, whether that's a man or a woman, with dignity and respect, then you need to get out. If you de-

mean someone in any way, then you need to get out. And if you can't treat someone from another race or a different color skin with dignity and respect, then you need to get out.

Reach for your phones. I'm serious, reach for your phones. OK, you don't have to reach for your phones, I'm going to give you an opportunity to reach for your phones. I want you to videotape this so that you can have it, so that you can use it, so that we all have the moral courage together, all of us on the staff tower lining the glass, all of us in this room. This is our institution, and if you need it, and you need my words, then you keep these words. And you use them and you remember them and you share them and you talk about them. If you can't treat someone with dignity and respect, then get out.

IN HONOR OF THE HONORABLE SAM FARR AND THE ELEVATION OF PINNACLES TO A NATIONAL PARK

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my predecessor in this seat, the Honorable Sam Farr, for one of the most significant accomplishments of his public career. In 2012, he led a remarkable bi-partisan effort to pass legislation that elevated the Pinnacles National Monument to our nation's 59th national park. On Saturday, October 7, the Pinnacles National Park Foundation will recognize Sam for this instrumental contribution to the conservation and interpretation of our nation's natural heritage.

Mr. Speaker, the Pinnacles is a truly remarkable place, but the Pinnacles National Park is more than its stunning scenery. The remnant of a 23 million-year-old volcano, the San Andreas fault carried the Pinnacles several hundred miles north to its present location. Its unique habitats form an island of biodiversity that is home to numerous unique plant and animal species, including the California Condor and over 400 species of bees.

It is also a place for people. The indigenous Amah Mutsun and Pinnacih peoples lived amongst, traveled through, and revered the Pinnacles for thousands of years. The Spanish friars planted one of California's first vineyards in the shadow of the Pinnacles. After California became part of the United States, local ranchers would take summer trips to the Pinnacles caves to escape the heat. A rancher from one of those families, Schuler Hain, led a public campaign to have the Federal Government protect the Pinnacles. That culminated in President Theodore Roosevelt designating the Pinnacles a National Monument in 1908.

In the 5 years since its elevation to National Park status, even more people have come to visit the Pinnacles. This has provided a remarkable boost for the surrounding communities' economies, who have seen increases in their hospitality business. Prior to arriving to Congress, I heard Sam tell the story that the idea to author legislation initially came during a Rotary meeting in a community near the Pinnacles. A Rotarian suggested that making the Pinnacles a National Park would help the local economy.

Sam took that idea, added the environmental conservation element, and crafted legislation that could garner widespread support. He found a Republican partner in our colleague JEFF DENHAM. Together, they helped steer the bill through the House and ultimately to President Obama's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in thanking Sam for his years of service, and in particular for his efforts to designate Pinnacles National Park. The Honorable Sam Farr has given us a living postcard we can send to our children and grandchildren. Our community is forever grateful for his service.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BOB
FRASCA

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, friends, partners and admirers of Bob Frasca are gathering in Portland to honor his career of over 50 years. Bob was a founder of one of America's leading architectural firms, Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Architects. Since its humble beginnings, ZGF has grown to be one of the premier architectural firms in the world with 600 design professionals networked across six offices in the U. S. and Canada. Portland, across the country, and around the world, ZGF has received accolades and awards for its design work.

The firm would not be where it is today without the leadership and influence of Bob Frasca.

Bob graduated with a Bachelor of Architecture from the University of Michigan, and a Master of City Planning from MIT. He moved to Portland in 1959 and became the partner-in-charge of design for ZGF in 1966. Over the years, I have witnessed his significant impact in the Portland region with his emphasis on designs that build communities. He has played an important role in the evolution of Portland as livable city, thanks to his collaboration with others and his advocacy for the civic role architects and architecture play in making a great city. He was instrumental in the redevelopment of Portland's waterfront and defined the "heart" of downtown that later became Pioneer Square. His design influence is seen in the Portland skyline with projects like the Justice Center, the KOIN Tower and the Oregon Convention Center, as well as Portland International Airport.

His portfolio of user-driven buildings has been recognized for creating environments that foster health and innovation, demonstrated by the National Institutes of Health Mark O. Hatfield Clinical Research Center, the Duke University Fitzpatrick Center for Interdisciplinary Sciences, and the Dana Farber Cancer Institute Yawkey Center for Cancer Care. His work in urban contexts has continued with projects such as Twelve West in Portland and 1200 Seventeenth Street in Washington, DC, and his international reach has touched U.S. embassies and consulates in Istanbul, Sofia, and Manila.

With Bob's leadership, ZGF's design excellence and architecture raised the firm's profile worldwide. Clients have engaged them to de-

velop projects from single structures to entire eco-districts, pioneering a new urban planning approach to create resilient neighborhoods, grounded in placemaking and community stakeholder engagement for a collective, sustainable vision.

Throughout his career, Bob has received numerous awards, including the AIA Northwest & Pacific Region Medal of Honor for his contributions to the built environment, his advocacy for design excellence and ongoing mentorship of emerging design talent, the Watzek Award for Contributions to the Enrichment of the State of Oregon, and the Honored Citizen Award from the Architectural Foundation of Oregon.

Bob Frasca's illustrious career deserves a hearty congratulations. His leadership, passion for the process of design, and ethic of environmental stewardship has raised the architectural bar and the quality of the urban experience throughout the nation, internationally, and most importantly, here at home in Portland, Oregon.

RECOGNIZING THE LEGAL
SERVICES OF GREATER MIAMI

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize an inspiring organization located in my Congressional District, Legal Services of Greater Miami, that for over 50 years has fought tirelessly for equality and justice for low income families of South Florida.

Legal Services is dedicated to helping our most vulnerable neighbors including women, children, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, low wage workers and the homeless, and continues to create a positive impact on our community.

Legal Services of Greater Miami has transitioned to a new location and will be better able to assist people in need.

Thank you to all the attorneys, to the staff and to the volunteers of Legal Services for providing much needed assistance to the most vulnerable members of our community.

TRIBUTE TO LIANNE DENNSTEDT

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Lianne Dennstedt, who passed away in Flagstaff, Arizona on Monday, September 18, 2017. Lianne was the eldest daughter of Brenda Dennstedt, Vice President of the Western Municipal Water District Board of Directors, and Shawn Dennstedt, a 24-year veteran of the San Diego County Sheriffs Department, as well as the older sister of Jaimee Dennstedt. She will be greatly missed.

Lianne attended Murrieta Valley High School in Murrieta, California, where she was a decorated cross country runner in addition to being an excellent student. Following her graduation in 2016 with a full International

Baccalaureate diploma, she decided to attend Northern Arizona University (NAU) in Flagstaff, Arizona, due to its high scholastic standards. In her freshman year at NAU, Lianne selected Environmental Science as her major and made the Dean's List both semesters.

Just a few weeks ago, Lianne had just begun her sophomore year at NAU when she became ill with a severe sore throat. A week later, she was admitted to the hospital with meningitis, double pneumonia and renal failure. Despite her strength, the unwavering support of her family and dedicated actions by her medical team, Lianne lost her battle with this aggressive illness. I join the Dennstedt family in expressing my heartfelt appreciation to the doctors, nursing staff and team of medical specialists at Flagstaff Medical Center for their heroic efforts, kindness and compassion during this incredibly difficult time.

I had the distinct privilege of knowing Lianne and her family for many years, and there are simply no words that soften the heartbreaking loss of Lianne's loving and bright spirit. I extend my heartfelt condolences to the entire Dennstedt family and her friends. Although Lianne may be gone, I know that the joy and happiness she brought to those around her will endure forever.

106TH NATIONAL DAY OF THE
REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 106th National Day of the Republic of China. The annual celebration commemorates the start of the Wuchang Uprising of October 10, 1911, which led to the collapse of the Qing dynasty in China and the establishment of the Republic of China on January 1, 1912. Double Ten Day is marked every year in Denver, Colorado with an honorable reception organized by our local Double Ten Day Celebration Committee.

I rise today to acknowledge Chairman, Dr. Paul C. Cheng and the volunteers who serve on the Double Ten Celebration Committee. Additionally, I would like to recognize the past Chairs of the Double Ten Celebration Committee who have served since I have represented the Sixth Congressional District; Nancy Tan, Nelson Ho, Ming Der Liu, Sylvia Edgar, Dr. Tai Dan Hsu, Lily Shen and Kevin Hsu, who have each year managed to expertly execute this important event in our community. The United States and Taiwan enjoy a long-standing relationship that stems from our shared values: democracy, the rule of law, and free enterprise. The Taiwanese-Americans living in Colorado bring a wealth of knowledge and entrepreneurial energy to our community, contributing in an integral way to its growth and success.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my warmest and best wishes to the people of Taiwan on this 106th National Day of the Republic of China. I also extend my congratulations to Chairman Dr. Paul C. Cheng and the Double Ten Celebration Committee on organizing another successful Double Ten Celebration for our community in Colorado. The work of this committee has helped the Taipei Economic and

Cultural Office to excel in its services to and relationship with the greater Denver area community. I look forward attending this event every year and to the continued and growing friendship and partnership between the United States and Taiwan.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF DUNCAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I mistakenly voted no on Roll Call No. 555 as I was distracted by reporters walking in to the Chamber due to the events in Las Vegas. I intended to vote yes on the Republican Study Committee Budget Substitute as I have for the previous six years.

TRIBUTE TO OREGON HONOR FLIGHT

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize 45 Oregon veterans who are visiting our nation's capital this Saturday, October 7, as part of the South Willamette Valley Honor Flight. These brave individuals risked their lives to protect and defend the United States and are now here to visit those monuments and memorials they helped inspire.

The veterans on this honor flight are as follows:

World War II—Bud Barnes, Army; Don Copenhagen, Army; Bud Garrett, Navy; Ed Hemmingson, Merchant Marines; Wally High, Navy; Arlie Holte, Army; Bob LeBlanc, Navy; Ray Maggard, Navy; Carl Mason, Navy; Ralph Morse, Marine Corps; Curt Wiese, Navy; Stan Wilson, Marine Corps.

Korean War—Larry Adair, Army; Gene Amundson, Army; Paulie Bokn, Army; Jim Broughton, Navy; Stan Clark, Air Force; Joe Couture, Air Force; John Dobson, Navy; Carl Gripenburg, Army; Marshall Heflin, Air Force; Don Hinkle, Navy; Terry Howard, Army; William Macauley, Air Force; Dorrance Mattson, Air Force; Ed Stelling, Army; Ida Stemple, Army; Charlie Stoakes, Army; Ed Sullivan, Air Force; Jay Surgeon, Navy; Ron Swanson, Air Force; Maurice Thorne, Air Force; Les Warner, Army.

Vietnam War—Kham Bounnavong, Army; Paul Fiegner, Army; Joe Grace, Army; Ken Henderson, Army; Mike Kisinger, Navy; Dick Mann, Army; Tim Mulhern, Marine Corps; Bob Pieper, Air Force; Ralph Wendt, Army; Bob Whitehead, Navy.

It is my privilege to include their names in the RECORD and my sincere hope that you'll join me in recognizing them for their extraordinary service.

TAIWAN 106TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 106th anniversary of the founding of Taiwan, also known as the Republic of China, which occurred following the Xinhai Revolution to overthrow the last imperial Chinese dynasty.

Taiwan has been nothing short of an economic miracle. Increased investment in infrastructure, education, and communications during the latter half of the 20th Century spurred rapid economic growth and elevated Taiwan to prominence as one of the "Four Asian Tigers." Taiwan is home to Foxconn, one of the largest electronics manufacturers in the world, as well as other large technology companies such as ASUS, Pegatron, and Quanta Computer.

The United States and Taiwan enjoy a strong, albeit unofficial, relationship, which is maintained by the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT). On the commercial side, Taiwan is the U.S.'s 9th largest trading partner and the U.S. is Taiwan's second largest trading partner. In 2016, U.S. trade with Taiwan totaled an estimated \$84.9 billion. Cultural relations have also prospered in recent years. Travel from Taiwan to the U.S. has increased by 50 percent since Taiwan became a member of the U.S. Visa Waiver Program in 2012.

My home state of Georgia also has a strong trade relationship with Taiwan. In 2013, the Georgia General Assembly passed a resolution supporting a free trade agreement between Taiwan and the U.S. Last year, Georgia's exports to Taiwan generated over \$420 million. Georgia's position as a global logistics and transportation hub has attracted investment from the Taiwanese auto parts industry. There are also a number of Georgia companies spanning across multiple industries that have operations in Taiwan.

As a member of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the people of Taiwan on their economic development in the last few decades. The hard work and ingenuity of the Taiwanese people are testaments to their economic success and flourishing democracy. I look forward to continued cooperation and goodwill between our two countries in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. GEORGE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH OF SHREVEPORT

HON. MIKE JOHNSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise and recognize the 100th anniversary of the St. George Greek Orthodox Church in Shreveport, La. For over a century, this congregation has blessed our community by spreading the love of God and continuing the tradition of giving back to one's neighbors.

In the beginning of the 20th century, some of the first Greek immigrants settled in Shreve-

port, La., and recognized the need for greater unity among the small community of orthodox families. They then founded a congregation that would grow to what we now know as the St. George Greek Orthodox Church. The name, "Saint George," was chosen in honor of the Saint George Church of New Ephesus in Asia Minor, which was destroyed during the Turko-Grecian struggle in 1917. Religious liberty is a core principle in the United States. While fleeing religious persecution, many Greeks found their new home in Northwest Louisiana.

Today, the church is considered the heart of the region's beloved Greek community and is distinguished by its rich and colorful artwork and architecture depicting insights of orthodoxy. The congregation of St. George has a long history of generosity and compassion and includes some of our closest personal friends. The congregation has hosted countless charitable events to support its three major philanthropic organizations: the Ladies Philoptochos Society, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association and the Daughters of Penelope. For over 60 years, the Philoptochos have held an annual pastry sale to raise funds for numerous charitable organizations, providing aid to anyone who may need it.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress and the people of Northwest Louisiana, I am privileged to recognize the St. George Greek Orthodox Church and celebrate over 100 years of their dedication to the betterment of our community. I, along with my wife, Kelly, pray the Lord continues to bless this congregation and their important ministries.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKY ROSEN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 4th, on Roll Call votes 551, 552, 553, and 554. I was not present because I was tending to my community in Las Vegas, in the aftermath of the deadliest mass shooting in United States history. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call vote 551, NAY on Roll Call vote 552, NAY on Roll Call vote 553, and NAY on roll call vote 554.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I would like to include in the RECORD letters from Social Security Works, AFSCME, SEIU, and the Coalition on Human Needs.

SOCIAL SECURITY WORKS,
October 4, 2017.

Hon. CEDRIC RICHMOND,
Chair, Congressional Black Caucus, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RICHMOND: We are writing to express our support for the FY18 Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) Alternative Budget. Your budget outlines responsible priorities, including strengthening Social Security benefits, and demonstrates the CBC's commitment to the best interests of the American people.

The CBC budget alternative is the complete opposite of the cruel legislative proposals contained in the Republican FY18 House Budget Resolution. While the Republican budget proposes cutting Social Security benefits and undermining Medicare and Medicaid, the CBC Alternative Budget works to improve Social Security and, more generally, our economic security, for all of us, including seniors, people with disabilities, children, and other vulnerable Americans.

The Congressional Black Caucus clearly understands that Social Security is a solution to a number of challenges facing the nation, including our looming retirement income crisis. Most workers—especially African-Americans—have seen their wages stagnate. They need insurance against the loss of wages in the event of death disability or old age, which Social Security provides, as opposed to more retirement income savings, which are a far less effective solution. Social Security is the primary retirement income for 72 percent of African-American seniors; we must work to protect Social Security benefits from any cuts, and work to expand its modest benefits.

The recommendation of the CBC Alternative Budget to adjust the cost of living calculations by using the Consumer Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) would be a great start to strengthening our Social Security system. The current formula for the Social Security cost-of-living-adjustment (COLA) is slowly eroding the value of Social Security's already modest benefits. Seniors and people with disabilities deserve a yearly raise that keeps pace with their actual costs of living, which are ever increasing due to the cost of pharmaceutical drugs and medical expenses.

Thank you for introducing the CBC budget alternative. The American people deserve a budget that fully funds vital programs, and not one that makes cuts to pay for tax handouts for wealthy Americans. We look forward to working with you during the formation of next year's CBC budget alternative to strengthen the proposal even further.

Sincerely,

NANCY J. ALTMAN,
President.
ALEX LAWSON,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,

Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

Hon. CEDRIC RICHMOND,
Chairman, Congressional Black Caucus,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I strongly endorse the alternative budget resolution proposed by the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC). The CBC budget represents the true needs of our nation and working families by supporting health care needs, basic living standards, nutritional assistance, job training, higher education and building better economic opportunities for everyone.

The budget decisions made by Congress each year are vital to ensuring that the

economy is strong and that our communities are safe and prosperous. Unfortunately, H. Con. Res. 71, the budget approved by the House Budget Committee, promotes the same misguided, inequitable priorities as the budget proposed by President Trump. The GOP budget sets woefully inadequate spending levels for critical public services and slashes \$5.8 trillion over 10 years from non-defense discretionary programs and critical entitlement programs. It hurts vital human needs to significantly boost defense spending and provide massive tax giveaways to wealthy individuals and corporations.

The CBC budget sets a better course by investing in public services that all Americans rely on, preserving and improving the Affordable Care Act, cancelling budget sequestration cuts, investing in infrastructure to create jobs and strengthen communities, investing in education from the cradle through college, targeting investments to eradicate poverty, improving retirement security, strengthening the right to vote and creating a fair tax code to meet our nation's needs.

The CBC budget embraces American families and promotes job growth and economic prosperity. I strongly urge support for the CBC budget.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

SEIU,

Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 2 million members of the Service Employees International Union ("SEIU"), I write in support of the Congressional Black Caucus's Alternative Budget for Fiscal Year 2018 ("Alternative Budget"). The Alternative Budget would make America's tax system fairer, rebuild the nation's infrastructure, and invest in our communities and children through programs designed to lift millions out of poverty.

The House Republican budget (H. Con. Res. 71) would cut programs like Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security in order the finance tax giveaways to the wealthy and big corporations. The CBC's Alternative Budget would require the wealthy and corporations to pay their fair share, the Alternative Budget would also invest \$1 trillion into a robust infrastructure program that would accelerate the economic recovery and revitalize communities across the nation.

Furthermore, the Alternative Budget would invest in community-focused programs that are designed to lift millions out of poverty. These investments include restoring funding to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), expanding access to affordable housing, increasing access to affordable and quality education, and increasing funding for job training programs. Each of these provisions would focus on rebuilding the middle class and creating an economy that improves the lives of American workers.

The CBC's Alternative Budget, along with the Congressional Progressive Caucus's "The People's Budget," are better paths forward for America's working families than H. Con. Res. 71. If you have any questions, please reach out to John Foti.

Sincerely,

JOHN GRAY,
Legislative Director.

COALITION ON HUMAN NEEDS,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Coalition on Human Needs, I strongly urge you to vote no on H. Con. Res. 71, the proposed FY 2018 Budget Resolution, and to vote for the substitute budgets advanced by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congress-

sional Black Caucus, and the Democratic alternative budget resolution.

The Coalition on Human Needs is an alliance made up of human service providers, faith organizations, policy experts, labor, civil rights, and other advocates for meeting the needs of low-income and vulnerable people. Our members understand that the economic security of millions of American families depends on building on the progress we've made in health coverage, jobs, basic living standards, and ensuring that our children are well-prepared for productive lives. But the majority's proposed budget does not build—it breaks apart our engines of progress. It will make our nation weaker for decades to come.

The most recent survey data on poverty in the U.S. shows the biggest two-year decline since the late 1960's. Refundable tax credits for working families, SNAP/food stamps and housing subsidies have lifted multi-millions of people out of poverty. The decline in the proportion of our population without health insurance continued its decline in 2016, down to 8.8 percent. More people are working, and in general, low-and moderate-income households have finally started to make income gains.

The budget advanced by the House Budget Committee would be a dangerous backwards plunge, stripping trillions of dollars from programs that work to reduce poverty and create security and opportunity. Medicaid, Medicare, working family tax credits, nutrition assistance, education and housing assistance: these are just some of the services the budget would massively cut. The budget takes trillions in funding that supports economic security and progress and hands it to the wealthy and corporations in the form of enormous tax cuts.

The primary goal of H. Con. Res. 71 is to allow huge tax cuts to be enacted with only a simple majority in the Senate. These tax cuts are claimed to be a critical element in increasing economic growth enough to make the tax cuts deficit neutral. Reputable economists are skeptical that the proposed tax cuts would boost the economy to the 2.6 percent average growth projected in the budget and acknowledge that tax cuts to corporations and the rich deepen the deficit. History supports this: the economy grew and unemployment declined more during the Clinton tax increase years than during the Bush era tax cuts. And the Kansas experience with tax cuts is cautionary: revenues plummeted, with the tax take in 2016 \$570 million lower than in 2013, even after counting increases enacted in sales and cigarette taxes. The economic growth that did occur from cutting taxes was estimated to bring in about \$30 million, leaving the state very deeply in the hole. The state legislature has recently reversed course, unwilling to slash education budgets as much as the revenue hole would have forced. They saw that they were weakening their state. Congress should not inflict the same dangerous lesson on the entire nation.

We urge you to reject H. Con. Res. 71 because of its central choice: paying for tax cuts that overwhelmingly favor the rich and corporations with cuts to essential services. Our nation faces major challenges: reducing disproportionate poverty among children and helping children and young adults to advance in education so they can meet the challenges in our economic future, protecting seniors in their retirement, and rebuilding communities. Both the emergency needs of communities devastated by natural disasters and the similarly urgent threats from opioids and other epidemics, decaying infrastructure and inadequate public health and consumer protections demand a vigorous federal response. Instead of making these investments, the House budget would cripple

the federal capacity to respond by slashing domestic appropriations by 44 percent compared with FY 2010 levels over the next decade and making similarly extreme cuts in health care, nutrition, income assistance for seniors, people with disabilities, and working families. In addition to trillions of dollars in cuts and structural constraints to basic mandatory programs, the budget would fast-track \$203 billion in cuts to domestic programs over the next ten years through reconciliation rules. Cuts like these would recklessly weaken us; they are self-inflicted wounds.

The proposed tax cuts will worsen inequality and reward businesses that park their income offshore. Instead, Congress should insist that corporations and the rich pay their fair share. Please vote against weakening America, and instead protect and expand investments as called for in the budgets proposed by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the House Budget Committee Democrats' substitute. These three constructive alternatives deserve your yes vote.

Sincerely yours,

DEBORAH WEINSTEIN,
Executive Director.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REMOVE THE STATUE OF CONFEDERATE GENERAL ALBERT PIKE

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill to require the removal of a statue of Confederate General Albert Pike, which is currently located on federal land near Judiciary Square in the District of Columbia. This statue was authorized by Congress in 1898, and was paid for by both federal and private funds—the Freemasons, of which Pike was a member, donated the majority of the money needed to build and install the statue in 1901. I oppose tearing down Confederate statues, because I believe they should be moved to more appropriate settings, like museums, to avoid erasing an important part of history from which Americans must continue to learn. However, Pike was a Confederate general who served dishonorably and was forced to resign in disgrace. Soldiers under his command were found to have mutilated the bodies of Union soldiers, and he was ultimately imprisoned after his fellow officers reported that he had been misappropriating funds. Adding to the dishonor of taking up arms against the United States, Pike dishonored even his Confederate military service. He certainly has no claim to be memorialized in the nation's capital. Even those who do not want Confederate statues removed will have to justify according Pike any honor considering his history.

After meeting with the Freemasons, I believe that the best course of action is to remove the statue and find a more appropriate place for it. The Freemasons themselves have said they "will support an action . . . to remove the statue forthwith so that it shall not serve as a source of contention or strife for the residents of our community." The Mayor of the District of Columbia and the D.C. Council also support the removal of the statue.

My bill clarifies that no federal funds will be used to take the Pike statue down. I urge my

colleagues to support this important legislation.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. JOSEPH OF MARAMURES ROMANIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to help commemorate the 25th anniversary of St. Joseph of Maramures Romanian Orthodox Church. St. Joseph's, the only Romanian Orthodox Church in Luzerne County, has grown from humble beginnings to become a beacon of faith in our community.

In 1992, a small group of Romanians located in Hazleton, Pennsylvania decided to form a mission. With nothing other than faith and a desire to succeed, their mission became a reality.

On April 19, 1992, with the blessing of the Romanian Orthodox Episcopate of America and His Eminence, Archbishop Nathaniel, St. Joseph's first Divine Liturgy was officiated by Rev. Fr. Onisie Morar. Over the next year, the Mission held its services in various locations, including Emil and Dorina Horga's property in Hazleton, where the first Resurrection Service was officiated, as well as St. Michael's Orthodox Church in Freeland. By the grace of God and the kindness of others, such as Fr. Lawrence Baigger, all of the church's services were officiated for its parishioners during this time.

While services were held at St. Michael's, the newly formed Mission began to organize and strengthen. The Mission Council and Ladies Auxiliaries Organization were formed and with them, so did the ability to obtain a personal place of worship. In 1993, the Mission Council purchased the United Methodist Church in Hazleton, adopting the name of Palm Sunday Romanian Church. When the mortgage was paid in 1999, the parish changed its name to St. Joseph of Maramures Romanian Orthodox Church.

Since then, through the dedication of its parishioners, the parish has formed a strong community within itself, as well as with others in the surrounding areas. With the guidance of Fr. Cristian Preda, the parish has continued to preserve the traditions of the Orthodox Christian faith, touching many lives in our community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing St. Joseph of Maramures Romanian Orthodox Church as it celebrates its 25th anniversary, and wishing its parishioners all the best in the years to come.

A HAPPY DOUBLE TEN DAY TO THE PEOPLE OF TAIWAN

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, October 10th is Taiwan's National Day—also known as Double Ten Day. I would like to take

this opportunity now to offer my early best wishes to the people of Taiwan.

As my colleagues are aware, Taiwan is a close friend, as well as security and trade partner of the United States. Accordingly, the United States has declared its support for Taiwan's meaningful participation in international organizations where its membership is not possible. In my home state of Iowa, we are enthusiastic to build on our already strong trade ties. In 2016, Iowa's exports to Taiwan reached \$153.87 million, making Taiwan Iowa's 5th largest export market in Asia.

Iowa and every state in the nation would benefit from the signing of a free trade agreement between Taiwan and the U.S., which would eliminate tariffs on most products and increase Taiwanese demand and Iowa exports. Though a small country with a population of 23 million, Taiwan has the potential to become a strong export market for Iowa and the U.S. Taiwan is a major importer of U.S. agriculture goods. Other sectors such as Iowa's strong wind energy sector have potential for bilateral cooperation as well.

Mr. Speaker, again, I wish the people of Taiwan a Happy Double Ten Day. And I take this opportunity to echo the words of Barry Goldwater when he said, "I have great affection for the Chinese people, their culture, their skills, and their potential."

RECOGNIZING DANA FERREIRA

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the commitment and dedication of my Senior Field Representative, Dana Ferreira. Dana served 15 years as an essential member of my team.

Dana graduated from Hartnell College in 1989 with her Associate of Arts in General Studies. After graduating, she became a licensed Insurance Agent for Marini Insurance Agency. Six years later, she joined my team while I worked for the California State Senate. In 2010, I was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and she stayed by my side as District Scheduler and later as a Senior Field Representative. Dana has been an integral member of my staff and instrumental in the successes of my district office.

Dana has established solid and lasting relationships in California's 10th District as a pillar in our community. From Mayors to community leaders, she has entered the lives of many through her professionalism and personality. Since 2003, Dana has been profoundly involved in the Rotary Club, beginning in Salinas and then in Modesto. She selflessly volunteers her time for many organizations and causes and has been recognized for many worthy achievements and accomplishments.

One of Dana's many preferred pastimes is attending concerts; she especially likes seeing her favorite band, Tesla. On Saturdays, you can catch Dana cheering on the Oklahoma Sooners football team with her two cats, Milo and Luca.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending my good friend, Dana Ferreira, for her many years of service, devotion, and outstanding contributions to our community.

We wish her continued success in her future endeavors.

U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS DISASTER
RELIEF

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge this body to send urgent aid to the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and all of our Caribbean neighbors in its federal response to this year's devastating hurricane season.

Hurricanes Harvey, Jose, Irma and now Maria have ravaged our southern border, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and our friends and neighbors in the Caribbean.

Sadly, the pace of federal response in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico has been much too slow.

Nearly three weeks after Hurricane Irma, a category 5 hurricane, decimated the Virgin Islands, residents are still having trouble receiving appropriate aid and commodities.

Now, nearly two weeks after another category 5 storm tore through St. Croix, the U.S. Virgin Islands' three main islands have lost its economy, its physical infrastructure and scores of its people.

Insufficient quantities of food and supplies, lack of power, extremely long fuel lines, and lack of communication and cell phone coverage have left the Virgin Islands utterly decimated.

The Virgin Islands are in a humanitarian crisis, Mr. Speaker. No American citizen should be forced to endure these conditions, especially not with the level of resources at the disposal of our federal government.

My heart breaks for these families. I urge my colleagues and the Trump Administration to fund all necessary resources not only to address the urgent humanitarian crisis but also the sustained commitment support funding necessary to help rebuild and restore infrastructure necessary for their economy and people to move forward.

IN CELEBRATION OF 25 YEARS OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN'S
WILLIAM DAVIDSON INSTITUTE

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate 25 years of the University of Michigan's William Davidson Institute (WDI). The Institute has helped shape businesses and social welfare through its distinguished international service and education.

In 1992, Guardian Industries, an international manufacturer of glass products, determined the importance of establishing an educational institute to contribute to the economic transformation that was occurring throughout the world as new market economies began to develop in previously socialist countries. They named it in honor of then Guardian Industries Chairman, President and CEO, William Davidson. Mr. Davidson envisioned a world class in-

stitute that helps "forge a path for those responsible for economic change in emerging markets." Since its founding, the William Davidson Institute has cultivated a repository of methods and resources for creating a market economy that is unmatched in its breadth and depth. From economic education to increased access to healthcare, WDI works with countries and world leaders to analyze specific areas of need and to institute change.

The Institute's main initiatives include education, financial sector development, health care, performance measurement and scaling impact. Staff at the William Davidson Institute work alongside businesses, government agencies and other academic institutions to implement initiative-based programs and economic change. Programs run by the Institute include: operating a community college initiative in Jordan that fosters business skills and vocational coursework, assessing equipment needed for a new hotel in Ethiopia, instituting wireless telecommunication service in rural communities in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, and upgrading the University of Liberia's accounting program to meet international education standards. The institute also serves as a partner to other international programs, including Goldman Sachs' 10,000 Women Program that helps underprivileged women in Rwanda grow their self-owned small businesses. Over the past 25 years, the William Davidson Institute has been a global leader in international economic development and social freedom. I know this Institute will continue to effect meaningful change in countries across the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the William Davidson Institute on its 25th anniversary. The Institute has been instrumental in growing economies and empowering business leaders internationally.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF LUZERNE COUNTY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to help commemorate the 50th anniversary of Luzerne County Community College. The College was founded in 1967 with just two buildings in Wilkes-Barre and 836 students, and has since become the largest college in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

As a student-centered learning institution, Luzerne County Community College gives students the tools they need to meet the world's most daunting challenges through practical access to real-world skills, classroom diversity that embodies the human experience, and quality teacher-student contact.

Seven years after its founding, the College moved to a permanent 122-acre campus in Nanticoke, which provided the necessary space to handle the increasing student population. Since 1974, the College has continued to expand its offerings to underserved areas throughout Northeastern Pennsylvania. It opened up sites in Hazleton, Berwick, Shamokin, Kulpmont, and downtown Wilkes-Barre. In 2008, Luzerne County Community College opened its Public Safety Training In-

stitute. Two years later, the College expanded its main campus into downtown Nanticoke by opening the Joseph A. Paglianite Culinary Institute. The following year, it opened the Francis S. and Mary Gill Carroza, R.N. Health Sciences Center.

Currently, the Luzerne County Community College offers 82 occupational programs, 24 liberal arts and transfer programs, and 10 credit-free career training programs. As of today, the College boasts more than 32,000 degree-holding alumni.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Luzerne County Community College as it celebrates its 50th anniversary. On behalf of a grateful community, I wish to thank the College, its faculty, and its staff for their tireless service to the community and unwavering commitment to accessible education.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
2018

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027:

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Democratic Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H. Con. Res. 27, the House Republicans' Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018.

Mr. Chair, House Republican budgeteers have a very poor track record when it comes to economic forecasts and projections.

For years, they have based their entire legislative agenda and strategy on their belief that the Affordable Care Act or Obamacare would be a failure.

The wish was father to the thought and they were wrong.

Because of Obamacare more than 20 million Americans now know the peace of mind that comes from affordable, quality health insurance that is there when you need it.

House Republicans oppose increasing the minimum wage, claiming that it costs jobs.

Wrong again.

Every increase in the minimum wage has been accompanied by an expanding economy, especially during the Clinton Administration.

House Republicans opposing comprehensive immigration reform claim that it will lead to lower incomes and lost jobs.

Wrong again.

Studies conducted by groups as far apart as the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO consistently show that comprehensive immigration reform will grow the Gross Domestic Product by \$1.5 trillion over 10 years.

Given this sorry track record of economic forecasting, it is mind-boggling that anyone could support another Republican budget that favors the wealthy over middle class families and those struggling to enter or remain in the middle class.

The Democratic Budget ANS represents a much better way forward to the economic prosperity and security that Americans want and demand because it:

1. Creates good-paying jobs by investing in cutting-edge research and innovation, education, and infrastructure—highways, broadband, school construction, and more.

2. Increases educational opportunities by enhancing the Pell Grant program and funds career, technical, and adult education, and supports initiatives to help borrowers manage their student debt.

3. Supports American workers and families through responsible tax reform that creates jobs, boosts economic growth, and ensures that the wealthy and big corporations pay their fair share.

4. Promotes economic growth, expanded opportunity, and better quality of life by supporting a raise in the minimum wage, equal pay for equal work, immigration reform, consumer safeguards, childcare, job training, and paid leave.

5. Protects a basic standard of living by funding for programs that ensure families can access nutrition assistance, find and afford quality housing in their neighborhood, heat and cool their homes when extreme temperatures hit, and supports strengthening and expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit and increased resources for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

6. Defends and strengthens the Affordable Care Act and protects Medicare by rejecting both Trumpcare and any plan to turn Medicare into a voucher-like system that would increase costs for seniors.

7. Rejects the Republican budget's 19 percent cut to diplomacy and foreign aid operations and invests instead in all aspects of national security, including our military and diplomatic corps, foreign aid, homeland security, veterans, and law enforcement.

The Democratic Budget ANS works FOR American families by giving them the tools to buy a home, send their kids to college and enjoy a secure retirement.

Mr. Chair, the Democratic Budget represents a better way.

We Democrats understand that we are all in this together and that our current economic situation calls for a balanced approach between increased revenues and responsible reduction in expenditures.

Our plan will protect and strengthen our recovering economy, reduce the deficit in a responsible way, while continuing to invest in the things that make our country strong like education, health care, innovation, and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, this Republican budget is bad for America but it is disastrous for the people from my home state of Texas who sent me here to advocate for their interests.

Let me highlight a few examples.

1. If the Republican budget resolution were to become the basis of federal fiscal policy, 3,435,336 Texas seniors would be forced out of traditional Medicare and into a voucher program.

2. Under the Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it, Texas seniors will receive a voucher instead of guaranteed benefits under traditional Medicare.

3. For the 3,435,336 Texans aged 45–54, the value of their vouchers would be capped at growth levels that are lower than the projected increases in health care costs.

4. Previous analyses showed that this type of plan would cut future spending by \$5,900 per senior, forcing them to spend more out of pocket and diminishing their access to quality care.

5. Additionally, private insurance plans will aggressively pursue the healthiest, least expensive enrollees, thereby allowing Medicare—currently the lifeline for 3,187,332 Texas seniors—to wither on the vine.

6. If the Republican budget resolution is adopted by Congress, 206,304 Texas seniors would pay more for prescription drugs next year.

7. The Republican plan would re-open the donut hole, forcing seniors to pay the full cost of their prescription drugs if their yearly drug expenses are more than \$2,970 for the year.

8. Seniors reaching the prescription drug donut hole would pay an average of \$828 more in prescription drug costs in 2018 and approximately \$13,000 more from now through 2027.

9. Under the Republican budget, the 2,445,462 Texas seniors who utilized free preventive services currently covered by Medicare in 2017 will face increased costs in the form of higher deductibles, co-insurance, and copayments for certain services, including even cancer screenings and annual wellness visits.

10. The Republican budget would slash \$33 billion in nursing home care and other health care services for 754,500 Texas seniors and disabled persons who currently rely on Medicaid for their long-term care needs.

11. The draconian cuts included in the Republican budget would have a devastating impact on the 1,191 certified nursing homes in Texas that serve nearly 100,000 seniors, with more than half relying on Medicaid as their primary payer. As a result, nursing homes would be forced to slash services, turn away seniors, or close their doors.

Mr. Chair, the Republican budget may be characterized in many ways—cruel, irresponsible, short-sighted, reckless—but “fair and balanced” is not one of them.

In contrast, the alternative budget proposed by the Democratic Caucus is worthy of support because it fairly balances the need for increased revenues and responsible reductions in expenditures with the imperative of making the necessary investments in human capital required to move our country forward.

The Democratic Budget ANS will generate at least a million more jobs this year compared to the Republicans' austerity first plan by making the investments needed to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, create greater upward mobility, and ensure opportunity for our children and future generations.

Mr. Chair, Democratic alternative budget maintains our commitment to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security; expands the EITC for childless workers; and provides ample funding for early childhood education.

Especially important to my constituents, and those of my colleagues representing Louisiana, Texas, Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico, is that the Democratic Budget ANS includes the funds approved by Congress as a down payment for assistance in response to Hurricane Harvey and supports further emergency funding related to Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, along with other natural disasters.

It is said often, Mr. Chair, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a fi-

nancial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values.

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

“The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.”

It is for this reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a moral test.

Unlike the Republican budget, the Democratic Budget ANS passes both of these tests with flying colors.

The Republican budget calls to mind what Talleyrand said of the restored Bourbon dynasty after the abdication of Napoleon:

“They had learned nothing and forgotten nothing.”

Like the discredited Ryan Budgets of years past, this repackaged and warmed over TrumpRepublican Budget seems to know the cost of everything but the value of nothing.

For these compelling reasons, I stand in strong opposition to the Republican budget and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting a much better deal for the American people, the Democratic Budget ANS.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CYBER BREACH NOTIFICATION ACT

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2017

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, the data breach at Equifax, one of three major American credit-reporting companies in the United States, exposed the personal and financial information of up to 143 million Americans. The data breach gave hackers access to Americans' highly sensitive personal and financial information, including Social Security numbers, birth dates, home addresses, driver's license numbers, credit card numbers, and credit dispute claims.

The data breach occurred in May 2017, and, the agency became aware of the breach on July 29, 2017, but did not report it to the public until 40 days later. The delay in disclosing the breach is concerning because almost half of all Americans' sensitive information could be in the hands of cyber criminals, who are willing and ready to use that information for identity fraud and other crimes.

Cyber breaches like this one present a risk to privacy and individuals' personal financial welfare. In 2002, I helped pass California's data breach law requiring businesses and government agencies to notify residents of data breaches. This notification law was instrumental in ensuring the public was informed and could mitigate harm. It is imperative that breaches are reported in a timely manner for individuals to begin taking the appropriate steps in protecting their identities and financial information.

That is why, today, I am introducing the Cyber Breach Notification Act to establish federal standards modeled after California's data

notification law and HIPAA's data notification provisions, which is currently in place to notify individuals of data breaches. This legislation will require businesses to notify individuals affected by data breaches "in the most expe-

dient time possible and without unreasonable delay." Additionally, this legislation establishes a federal standard for data breach notification laws, but does not preempt current state breach notification laws or preclude states

from creating more robust laws. This will ensure that millions of Americans are given proper and timely notice after a data breach to begin to mitigate harm.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6327–S6376

Measures Introduced: Thirty-seven bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1921–1957, and S. Res. 285–290. **Pages S6358–60**

Measures Reported:

S. 34, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for “midnight rules”. (S. Rept. No. 115–164)

S. 906, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for congressional notification regarding major acquisition program breaches, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 115–165)

S. 938, to require notice of cost-free Federal procurement technical assistance in connection with registration of small business concerns in procurement systems. (S. Rept. No. 115–166)

H.R. 1293, to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees. (S. Rept. No. 115–167)

S. 1514, to amend certain Acts to reauthorize those Acts and to increase protections for wildlife, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–168) **Page S6358**

Measures Passed:

Water Infrastructure Flexibility Act: Senate passed S. 692, to provide for integrated plan permits, to establish an Office of the Municipal Ombudsman, to promote green infrastructure, and to require the revision of financial capability guidance, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S6373–74**

Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act: Senate passed S. 1103, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department-wide guidance and to develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign. **Pages S6374–75**

Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 1595, to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S6375**

McConnell (for Rubio) Amendment No. 1110, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S6375**

National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 287, designating October 8, 2017, as “National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day”. **Page S6375**

National Community Policing Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 288, designating the week of October 1 through 7, 2017, as “National Community Policing Week”. **Page S6375**

National Wildlife Refuge Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 289, designating the week beginning October 8, 2017, as “National Wildlife Refuge Week”. **Page S6375**

Energy Efficiency Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 290, designating October 5, 2017, as “Energy Efficiency Day” in celebration of the economic and environmental benefits that have been driven by private sector innovation and Federal energy efficiency policies put in place over the past 4 decades. **Page S6375**

Authority for Committees—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the Senate’s adjournment, committees be authorized to report legislative and executive matters on Friday, October 13, 2017, from 9 a.m. until 11 a.m. **Page S6375**

Pro Forma Sessions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, October 6, 2017 at 10:30 a.m.; Tuesday, October 10, 2017 at 9:15 a.m.; Friday, October 13, 2017 at 8:30 a.m.; and that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, October 13, 2017, it

next convene at 4 p.m., on Monday, October 16, 2017. **Page S6375**

Gingrich Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Holy See, Department of State. **Pages S6332–46**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 75 yeas to 20 nays (Vote No. 216), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S6339–40**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 4 p.m., on Monday, October 16, 2017, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided between the two Leaders or their designees. **Page S6375**

Trachtenberg Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that following Leader remarks on Tuesday, October 17, 2017, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of David Joel Trachtenberg, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, and that there be 10 minutes of debate on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination, with no intervening action or debate. **Page S6348**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 65 yeas to 32 nays (Vote No. EX. 213), Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004. **Pages S6328–31**

Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years. **Pages S6331, S6375**

By 54 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 215), Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security. **Pages S6331–32, S6375**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 54 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 214), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S6331–32**

Stephen B. King, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic.

Barbara Lee, of California, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Seventy-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Christopher Smith, of New Jersey, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Seventy-second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

J. Steven Dowd, of Florida, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years. **Page S6348**

Timothy Gallaudet, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

Howard R. Elliott, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.

Walter G. Copan, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology. **Pages S6348–49**

Bruce J. Walker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability). **Page S6349**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

R. D. James, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Bruce D. Jette, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Shon J. Manasco, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

David J. Ryder, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Mint for a term of five years.

Leon A. Westmoreland, of Georgia, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Lisa A. Johnson, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia.

Kate S. O'Scannlain, of Maryland, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

Mitchell Zais, of South Carolina, to be Deputy Secretary of Education.

Frank M. Coffman, of Oklahoma, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for the term of four years.

Kurt D. Engelhardt, of Louisiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Thomas M. Griffin, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States Marshal for the District of South Carolina for the term of four years.

Mark S. James, of Missouri, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Missouri for the term of four years.

Johnny Lee Kuhlman, of Oklahoma, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Oklahoma for the term of four years.

Daniel C. Mosteller, of South Dakota, to be United States Marshal for the District of South Dakota for the term of four years.

Gary G. Schofield, of Nevada, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada for the term of four years. **Page S6375**

Messages from the House: **Page S6358**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S6358**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6360–61**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S6361–69

Additional Statements: **Pages S6354–58**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6369–72**

Authorities for Committees to Meet:
Pages S6372–73

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—216) **Pages S6331, S6332, S6340**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 5:51 p.m., until 10:30 a.m. on Friday, October 6, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6375.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Gregory Ibach, of Nebraska, to be Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, who was introduced by Senators Fischer and Sasse, and William Northey, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, who was introduced by Senator Grassley, both of the Department of Agriculture, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Budget: Committee ordered favorably reported the original concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

NOMINATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Paul Trombino III, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Ernst, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Jeffrey Gerrish, of Maryland, to be a Deputy United States Trade Rep-

resentative (Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and Industrial Competitiveness), Department of State, Gregory Doud, of Kansas, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, and Jason Kearns, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 832, to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 245, calling on the Government of Iran to release unjustly detained United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens; and

S. Res. 211, condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya, with amendments.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Carla Sands, of California, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Denmark, and W. Robert Kohorst, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Croatia, both of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

FEDERAL RESPONSE TO THE OPIOID CRISIS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Federal response to the opioid crisis, after receiving testimony from Elinore McCance-Katz, Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Deborah Houry, Director, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Francis Collins, Director, National Institutes of Health, and Scott Gottlieb, Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, all of the Department of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Amy Coney Barrett, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Joan Louise Larsen, of Michigan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, William L. Campbell, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee, Thomas Lee Robinson Parker, to be

United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, Eric S. Dreiband, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Robert M. Duncan, Jr., to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of four years, Charles E. Peeler, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Georgia for the term of four years, and Bryan D. Schroder, to be United States

Attorney for the District of Alaska, all of the Department of Justice.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 3963–3988; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. were introduced. **Pages H7886–88**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H7888–89**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows: H.R. 2989, to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–340). **Page H7886**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. Timothy Kesicki, Jesuit Conference, Washington, DC. **Page H7845**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H7845, H7882**

Establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 71, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 206 nays, Roll No. 557. Consideration began yesterday, October 4th. **Pages H7846–82**

Rejected:

McClintock amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 115–339) that sought to balance the budget while bringing solvency to Social Security, Medicare, and the Federal Government, reforming the tax code, and providing for national security (by a recorded vote of 139 yeas to 281 noes, Roll No. 555); and **Pages H7846–63**

Yarmuth amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 115–339) that sought to focus on fostering growth, creating jobs, and building the economy; protect health care for the middle class and struggling families and ensure national security; and support comprehensive immigration re-

form and disaster response funding to help Americans rebuild after the recent hurricanes (by a recorded vote of 156 yeas to 268 noes, Roll No. 556). **Pages H7863–79**

H. Res. 553, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) was agreed to yesterday, October 4th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, October 6th and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, October 10th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H7883**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H7873.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7862–63, H7879, H7881–82. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 12:23 p.m.

Committee Meetings

POWERING AMERICA: CONSUMER-ORIENTED PERSPECTIVES ON IMPROVING THE NATION'S ELECTRICITY MARKETS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled "Powering America: Consumer-Oriented Perspectives on Improving the Nation's Electricity Markets". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE EQUIFAX DATA BREACH

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Examining the Equifax Data Breach". Testimony was heard from a public witness.

THE ROHINGYA CRISIS: U.S. RESPONSE TO THE TRAGEDY IN BURMA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Rohingya Crisis: U.S. Response to the Tragedy in Burma”. Testimony was heard from W. Patrick Murphy, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Southeast Asia, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State; Mark C. Storella, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, Department of State; and V. Kate Somvongsiri, Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development.

HIGH-TECH AGRICULTURE: SMALL FIRMS ON THE FRONTIER OF AGRIBUSINESS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy, and Trade held a hearing entitled

“High-Tech Agriculture: Small Firms on the Frontier of Agribusiness”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,
OCTOBER 6, 2017**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10:30 a.m., Friday, October 6

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:30 a.m., Friday, October 6

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 10:30 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1334, E1335
 Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1329, E1332
 Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1331
 Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1331
 Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E1329
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1331

Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E1336
 DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E1332
 Denham, Jeff, Calif., E1334
 Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E1335
 Duncan, Jeff, Ill., E1332
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1330
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1335
 Johnson, Mike, La., E1332

King, Steve, Iowa, E1334
 Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1335
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia,
 E1334
 Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E1329, E1330
 Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E1331
 Rosen, Jacky, Nev., E1332
 Scott, Robert C. "Bobby", Va., E1332



Congressional Record

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.