



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 2017

No. 2

## Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon 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.

Eternal Spirit, our guide and strength, we need Your guidance. Show us the path to meaningful life. Reveal to us the steps of faith.

Today, use the Members of this body to do Your will. Quicken their hearts and purify their minds. Broaden their concerns and strengthen their commitments.

Lord, show them duties left undone. Remind them of promises unkept and reveal to them tasks unattended. Lead them, Father, through this season of challenge to a deeper experience with You. Then, send them from Your presence to be Your instruments of good in transforming our Nation and world.

We pray in Your mighty 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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

### A CHANGE IN DIRECTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 2 years ago the American people sent a new majority to the Senate. They called for a change in direction. They called for the Senate to get to work. So

we got committees functioning again, we gave Members of both parties a say again, and we put the Senate back to work again and back on the side of the American people.

Because we did, we were able to get important things done with a President of a different party. We put an end to the number of Washington artificial cliffs and punts. We helped make our infrastructure stronger. We helped make our communities healthier and our country safer. We gave our children more opportunities to succeed in school, and we helped ensure that those who suffer exploitation and abuse—whether veterans or the victims of human trafficking—can know more of the justice, hope, and care they deserve.

I am proud of what we were able to achieve in a time of divided government, just as I am excited about the possibilities that lie ahead.

We now stand on the horizon of a new era. We seated a new Congress yesterday. We will inaugurate a new President later this month. The challenges ahead are great, and the work to come will be hard, but just as we heard the voices of the American people in 2014, we heard their message this last election as well. Americans called for change from the last 8 years and for hope, at long last. Each of us, regardless of party, has a mandate to help and to play a role.

The first way to begin realizing that hope, in my view, is to remove the things that are hurting families right now. The President-elect will have an important role to play there, especially in addressing overbearing, ideologically driven regulations.

Congress will have its role too. In terms of what we can do here most immediately, ObamaCare is at the top of the list. It is the very first item we will consider this session. We will continue to devote significant time to it as well.

I know some of our Democratic friends would prefer we didn't act—

that we just sit on our hands as premiums jump higher, as more Americans lose plans, and as others continue to struggle with insurance too costly to actually use. That is essentially the message the outgoing President came this morning to deliver. The incoming Vice President came this morning, too, and delivered an entirely different message.

But repeal is just the first step. We know it will take time to undo the damage of this partisan law. We want—and we will need—the contributions of all colleagues as we turn to the development of a lasting, durable reform.

The same is true of our economy. We know the economy over the last 8 years hasn't lived up to its potential—not for working people, not for small businesses, and certainly not for the next generation. We will have disagreements about the best way forward. That is entirely natural. But, if we look, we will continue to find areas of agreement too. There are important contributions for each of us to make. That is the lesson of the 114th Congress.

A more open Senate is a more empowering Senate, but it is also a more demanding Senate. It gives each of us more of a say in the development of legislation, just as it requires more of a responsibility in cooperating. In short, it gives the minority party a stake in governing and thus the obligations that come along with that.

I welcome our colleague from New York in his new role as Democratic leader. The role of leading a party is never easy. He has a tough job ahead of him. I respect him for that. While I know we will often disagree, I am also reminded of his words just before the election. "We have a moral obligation," the Democratic leader said just before the election, "even beyond the economy and politics, to avoid gridlock and get the country to work again."

"We have to get things done," he said.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S29

If that is our guiding principle, then I know we can make this session a success. It is what will allow us to get the appropriations process moving, for example. We can set the pace now by working toward a smooth nomination process.

I ask our Democratic friends to remember the consideration we showed President-Elect Obama's nominees in 2009. We approved seven—seven—members of his Cabinet unanimously within hours of his inauguration. Seven nominees for President Obama's Cabinet were approved unanimously within hours of his inauguration.

Now, some nominations will be more contentious. I am sure that will be true, of course, of the Supreme Court. It has been clear throughout that the next President would name the next Supreme Court Justice. I maintained that position even when many thought a President of a different party would be taking the oath this month. Now the President who won the election will make the nomination, and the Senate that the American people just re-elected will consider that nomination.

But not everything need become so contentious. We will have many opportunities to cooperate. I have mentioned several already. We will see many more in committee. Shortly, we hope to see an example of that in the Intelligence Committee, where Chairman BURR will lead Members of both parties in a serious, comprehensive, and responsible review of any Russian involvement in our elections. Leader SCHUMER will join the committee as an ex-officio member and will be able to review the reports of the intelligence community. The Armed Services Committee will review how best to tie our cyber capabilities to our warfighting doctrine.

It is just this type of issue—something both parties say is too important to become a partisan football—where we often see the hard work of legislating and oversight transcend party. We saw it last Congress when, for instance, Members of both parties came together—and held together—on highways, on efforts to cure incurable diseases, and on providing TPA authority to both the current President and the next one. I hope we will see similar cooperation on many issues to come.

The American people are watching us. They are hurting. They are calling for a change in direction. It is now our united responsibility to move forward with their needs and their priorities as our guide.

Let me again welcome every new Member of the Senate. I want again to congratulate the Democratic leader, and let me again acknowledge President-Elect Trump for an impressive victory. He heard the voices of Americans in every part of the country in ways others have not. He now carries a heavy burden.

We will work with him to help the American people feel confident again—confident in themselves and confident in their futures.

We look forward to the inauguration in just over 2 weeks. There is now much serious work to be done. I look forward to working with each of you to achieve it.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to proceed to S. Con. Res. 3 occur following the remarks of Senator SCHUMER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. Con. Res. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I apologize to my good friend the Republican leader. I couldn't be here for his remarks. I intended to be, but our President stayed longer and then I was meeting with the Vice President-elect. I apologize for that.

I also wish to recognize the distinguished majority leader and reiterate what I said yesterday: I sincerely hope, just as I heard he hopes, that we can find common ground in the Senate. While we at all times inevitably disagree on the right way forward for our country, I know he is a patriot who

cares deeply about this institution. That matters a lot to me. I learned that through a meeting set up by my friend from Tennessee. We had a dinner, and I walked away convinced that Leader MCCONNELL cares a lot about making the institution function. That matters, and that can maybe help us through some of the rougher times. We know it has grand principles, grand practices, and a grand tradition in our national life, something we both want to preserve.

Yesterday, in my opening remarks as a Senate leader, I did remind our Republican majority and the President-elect that there would indeed be places where we can work together, and I named a few of them, but let me be perfectly clear, kicking millions of Americans off their health care and throwing the entire health care system into chaos is not one of them.

I am deeply troubled that the Republican majority and seemingly the President-elect are plotting, as one of their first campaigns in the new Congress, a full-scale assault on the American health care system, not just the Affordable Care Act but Medicare and Medicaid as well because they are inextricably bound. Those are the pillars that support the American health care system, but as its first order of legislative business, the Republican majority has decided to put forward a budget resolution to repeal health care reform. Although he promised not to cut Medicare in the campaign, the President-elect has nominated a man who spent his career strategizing health care's demise, and he chose him to be Secretary of HHS. I don't think that is something a vast majority of Americans or even Republicans believe in.

It is too clear that President-Elect Trump and the Republican Congress are intent on making America sick again. Republicans seem determined to create chaos, not affordable care, for the American people.

Today, I would like to focus on the budget resolution on the Affordable Care Act. I understand why the majority thinks they have to do it. Over the past 8 years, they promised every group—conservative group and audience in the country, they would repeal the law, “root and branch.”

For a long time, it has been only a conservative fever dream. Republicans knew they could make extreme promises about replacing it with something better without ever having to consider the consequences or even come up with a reasonable plan to replace it because they knew the Democrats or President Obama would ultimately block their attempts to roll back the law.

Now things are different. The consequences of repealing the Affordable Care Act are real. I sincerely urge my colleagues to deeply consider the consequences. It is no longer just a game or a political line to say “repeal” because now you have to replace. So far, it has been 5 years of repeal, repeal, repeal; not one replace plan has garnered

a lot of support even on the Republican side of the aisle, let alone in America.

What will it mean for average Americans if you repeal the law without any viable replacement? Not just the 30 million who might lose coverage right away—that is a staggering number, many of them in very red and poor States and rural areas. What will happen to the overall marketplace if you rip away all the safeguards of the ACA and have put nothing in its place?

It doesn't matter if you repeal and delay, as some of my friends on the other side of the aisle call it, for 1 year or 2 years—however long. Folks will lose a lot of benefits, and the insurance marketplace could fall apart long before repeal goes into place. As insurers raise their prices because they have to with repeal, costs to the average American who has employer insurance will go up as well. My colleagues will own that, just as we owned everything that happened previous to this election.

Let me tell you, if Republicans pull the plug on health reform, on Medicaid, and privatize Medicare, it could mean absolute chaos, not affordable care. It would likely increase prescription drug costs, premiums, and out-of-pocket costs to American families—not, as I said, just for the families that got coverage on the exchanges but for all American families, even if you get insurance through your employer. I repeat that to America. Everyone who has employer-based insurance and is not part of the ACA should worry about this repeal with no replace because their costs will go up, sure as we are here together. It would put insurance companies back in charge. It would allow them to discriminate against individuals with preexisting conditions.

We all know of people. Parents—their kid has cancer. They would look for an insurance company. Oh, no, your son has cancer, your daughter has cancer, you can't get it. What are our colleagues going to do about that one? No answers yet. I doubt they have good ones. It would cause premiums to skyrocket. It would unravel the insurance market.

I would ask my colleagues before they jump into this repeal to talk to their local rural hospitals. In my State, rural hospitals are a mainstay of our rural economy. They are the largest employer in many of our towns and villages. Remember, New York has New York City, but we are the third largest rural State in the Nation, only behind Pennsylvania and North Carolina. In those areas, merely repealing the ACA and not doing anything else is going to hurt those hospitals dramatically. In fact, today, in 11 State capitals, rural hospitals—many of them in red States—protested a repeal of the ACA.

It could also exacerbate—I don't want to forget—the opioid epidemic by ripping away coverage from 1.6 million newly insured individuals struggling with substance abuse disorders. We worked so hard in the Cures Act to

cover people. Far more would be undone by this act of repeal in terms of fighting opioid abuse.

For all my deficit-hawk friends, your proposal causes a trillion-dollar hole in the budget—at least a trillion. My colleague from Washington thinks it might be even higher, and I rarely doubt her. What are you going to do, deficit hawks, once you repeal and that hole in the budget becomes enormous?

This is not conjecture. My Republican colleagues would be wise to remember how the American health care system operated before health care reform. Health care costs were growing at a much faster rate than they are today, eating into workers' paychecks and dissuading them from taking risks and changing jobs lest they lose a good coverage plan. A debilitating illness could wipe out a lifetime of hard-earned savings because there was no cap on health care costs. Women were charged more than men for the same health coverage. It was outrageous. We will go back to those days with repeal.

Many couldn't get insurance if they had a preexisting condition. Some insurance companies would simply delete you from their rolls if you got sick. You want to go back to those "good old days"?

Today, because of health care reform, those things are no longer true. Health care costs are rising much more slowly than before, and the uninsured rate is the lowest it has ever been. I don't think any American would want to go back to the health care world of yesterday where insurance companies wrote the rules and costs spiraled up unchecked, but Republicans seem all too eager to dial back the clock and make America sick again.

Democrats are united in our opposition to cutting Medicare, to cutting Medicaid, and to repealing health care reform, and we will hold the Republican majority and the President-elect accountable for the consequences of repealing health care reform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 1 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander  
Barrasso  
Blunt  
Boozman  
Burr  
Capito  
Cassidy  
Cochran  
Collins

Corker  
Cornyn  
Cotton  
Crapo  
Cruz  
Daines  
Enzi  
Ernst  
Fischer

Flake  
Gardner  
Graham  
Grassley  
Hatch  
Heller  
Hoeven  
Inhofe  
Isakson

Johnson  
Kennedy  
Lankford  
Lee  
McCain  
McConnell  
Moran  
Murkowski

Perdue  
Portman  
Risch  
Roberts  
Rounds  
Rubio  
Sasse  
Scott

Sessions  
Shelby  
Sullivan  
Thune  
Tillis  
Toomey  
Wicker  
Young

NAYS—48

Baldwin  
Bennet  
Blumenthal  
Booker  
Brown  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Carper  
Casey  
Coons  
Cortez Masto  
Donnelly  
Duckworth  
Durbin  
Franken  
Gillibrand

Harris  
Hassan  
Heinrich  
Heitkamp  
Hirono  
Kaine  
King  
Klobuchar  
Leahy  
Manchin  
Markey  
McCaskey  
Menendez  
Merkley  
Murphy  
Murray

Nelson  
Paul  
Peters  
Reed  
Sanders  
Schatz  
Schumer  
Shaheen  
Stabenow  
Tester  
Udall  
Van Hollen  
Warner  
Warren  
Whitehouse  
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The motion was agreed to.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### RECESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy lunches.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:21 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ROUNDS).

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the two sides during quorum calls.

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

Mr. ENZI. 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. ENZI. 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. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the duration of the Senate's consideration of S. Con.

Res. 3, the majority and Democratic managers of the concurrent resolution, while seated or standing at the managers' desks, be permitted to deliver floor remarks, retrieve, review, and edit documents, and send email and other data communications from text displayed on wireless personal digital assistant devices and tablet devices.

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

Mr. ENZI. I further ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the budget resolution.

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

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, today we have a new Congress. Soon we will have a new President. For the first time in years, hardworking Americans will have their voices heard as we take the first steps to repair the Nation's broken health care system—steps to remove Washington from the equation and to put control back where it belongs—with the patients, their families, and their doctors.

The President's health law has pushed insurance markets to the brink of collapse. Premiums for hardworking families are soaring, while patients' choices are dwindling. I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to face the facts that ObamaCare has failed to deliver on its core promises and is hurting far more than it is helping.

I know our colleagues on the other side of the aisle share our goal of a robust health care system for hardworking families, and I truly hope they will work with us to find common ground that delivers more choices and lowers costs. I welcome the input from all the Nation's lawmakers as we endeavor to listen to the American people in this pursuit. But first, it is important to remember how we got here so that the actions that we will be taking this year are considered in proper context.

After the 2008 election, Democrats controlled the Presidency and had a majority in the House and a supermajority in the Senate. This allowed Senate Democrats in 2009 to pass a health care plan without any Republican support, which is exactly what they did. House Democrats had initially approved a health care reform bill with several important differences. So congressional Democrats needed to address these concerns in a conference committee. But plans to iron out the differences between the House and Senate versions were derailed in early 2010, when Democrats lost their filibuster-proof majority with the Massachusetts special election that resulted in placing Senator Scott Brown in the seat formerly held by the late Senator Ted Kennedy. He had held that seat since 1962.

With the filibuster-proof majority lost, Democrats in the House approved the Senate-passed health care bill without any Republican votes and sent

it to the President, while vowing to use the budget reconciliation process to address their colleagues' concerns with the Senate legislation.

Subsequent budget reconciliation legislation was passed by Democrats and signed into law by President Obama. Combined with the initial health care bill, ObamaCare was created.

Now, I share this brief history of ObamaCare only as a reminder that, while my colleagues will surely complain about using the reconciliation process to untangle the country from this unworkable, unpopular, and unaffordable law, they should remember they actually employed the exact same procedure to secure the passage of ObamaCare.

Recent headlines show the ObamaCare problem is only getting worse and discourages people from seeking so-called coverage. Last October, at Bloomberg's The Year Ahead Summit in New York, the CEO of Aetna discussed the issues surrounding their decision not to participate in ObamaCare exchanges, saying:

As the rates rise, the healthier people pull out because the out-of-pocket costs aren't worth it. . . . Young people can do the math. Gas for the car, beer on Fridays and Saturdays, health insurance.

Now, if you are young and healthy, ObamaCare has made it an easy choice to opt out of health coverage. But if you are not so fortunate—for those who must have coverage—it quickly becomes a frightening reality. I have constituents in Wyoming who have written to me, with worry and concern about their surging health insurance premiums. I recently heard from a young woman who is experiencing the worst of this law. She said:

Dear Senator Enzi,  
I am writing with concerns specifically in the way that our country is heading in respect to healthcare services.

I am a 25 year old with no medical conditions, I rarely need a doctor visit, however as I looked into the health insurance for me and my 8 month old son, also without health problems, I have found insurance to be incredibly expensive. Based on the cost of our health care last year, which included a C-section and the birth of our son, our family would spend less on health care if we paid for medical expenses out of pocket and did not have health insurance. However, in order to obey the law this is not an option.

I have researched and calculated the most cost effective health care option for our family. We are looking at paying almost \$800 a month for our insurance, even with my husband receiving insurance through work. This is almost 1/3 of our family's monthly income. . . . Insurance is becoming a huge burden for our family.

Now, that is the reality for many of our constituents across the country. She is trying to do the right thing for her family's health, but the law is crippling them financially. Our answer must be to not ignore these problems. For many Americans caught up in ObamaCare's tangled and expensive web of regulations, the situation is grim and only getting worse by the day. It is time to act.

One of the most disturbing parts of this law is that Americans are now paying more in taxes to pay for the very health law that is driving up their insurance premiums. The law will saddle American households with \$1 trillion—\$1 trillion—in new taxes and penalties over the next 10 years, unless Congress acts. ObamaCare's crushing regulations mean smaller paychecks for families, while holding back small businesses from expanding and hiring new workers. For every American, ObamaCare has meant more government, more bureaucracy, and more rules and regulations, along with soaring health care costs—along with soaring health care costs.

It is time to lift the burdens and higher costs this law has placed on all Americans. The Senate is poised to pass a repeal resolution that will set the stage for true legislative relief from ObamaCare that Americans have long demanded, while ensuring a stable transition in which those with insurance will not lose access to health care coverage.

Let me repeat that. The Senate is poised to pass a repeal resolution that will set the stage for true legislative relief from ObamaCare that Americans have long demanded, while ensuring a stable transition in which those with insurance will not lose access to health care coverage. This will allow us to move step-by-step on a new set of reforms, listening carefully to the advice of the millions of Americans affected and to do our best to make sure that we proceed wisely and do no harm.

Fortunately, America now has a President committed to repealing ObamaCare and moving toward a system that offers more choices, lower costs, and more individual control for millions of hardworking Americans.

The American people have endured a lot under ObamaCare and its broken promises. As a Presidential candidate not so long ago, then-Senator Barack Obama, a Democrat from Illinois serving here, promised Americans they could keep their health plan if they liked it. Millions soon learned they couldn't, and others soon wouldn't. This is because ObamaCare has drastically reduced Americans' choice of health care plans through a Federal takeover of the insurance marketplace. In fact, the President's promise that "if you like your plan, you can keep it" has proven to be one of many unfulfilled and unattainable promises of ObamaCare.

In Wyoming, we have seen the real impact of ObamaCare on our health insurance market. Wyoming now only has one health insurer in the individual market, both on and off the ObamaCare exchange. Many States are experiencing a similar issue of having insurers leaving the exchanges entirely. So for Wyomingites, the Obama administration's talking points about "choice" were in the end just more empty promises.

Americans were also promised lower health care costs, but even the administration admits that ObamaCare is failing to address costs, with average premiums rising by 25 percent for silver-level plans on the Federal exchange. That is in 1 year. This means that families have to decide whether to purchase unaffordable insurance or to pay a fine. In most cases, they are literally paying more money for less control over their health care.

Health care costs in Wyoming continue to be among the highest in the Nation, with other States not far behind. ObamaCare's mandates and taxes on employer-sponsored health plans are not only leading to higher out-of-pocket expenses but also to fewer choices and fewer services for the 150 million Americans with employer-sponsored health benefits. Let me repeat that: The mandates and taxes on employer-sponsored health plans are not only leading to higher out-of-pocket expenses but to fewer choices and services for the 150 million Americans with employer-sponsored health benefits.

According to the nonpartisan Kaiser Family Foundation, individual employees who have job-based insurance have seen their out-of-pocket expenses climb by hundreds of dollars year after year. Employees working for small businesses now have deductibles of over \$1,800 on average. Since ObamaCare became law, several large employers have stopped offering benefits to part-time employees altogether.

Over the past 50 years, our Nation has made great strides in improving the quality of life for all Americans, but these transformative changes are always forged in the spirit of bipartisan compromise and cooperation. These qualities are essential to the success and longevity of crucial programs such as Medicare and Medicaid.

This is a crucial time for health care in America. We do not have the luxury of ignoring the growing problems in the health insurance markets and the crushing premiums faced by families across our country. That is why we are doing this first. The failures of ObamaCare have metastasized since its passage.

We must act now to repeal ObamaCare and provide relief to the millions of Americans who have been harmed by this law. Relief will require a stable transition period, which ensures those with coverage today continue to have access to health care tomorrow. Unwinding this tangle of partisan gridlock to make meaningful changes will not be easy. Our goal is to create a health care system where Washington makes fewer decisions and families are empowered to control their own health care with more choices and lower costs.

This is where we find ourselves today. Congress and soon the new President will be in a position to begin the process of repealing ObamaCare. Passing this resolution is just the first step on a path to repair health care for

millions of hard-working Americans whose experiences with ObamaCare have meant broken promises, higher costs, and fewer choices.

This is the budget resolution we are debating now. As far as the budget part of it, all this is, is a statement of where we are at the moment. This budget went into effect last October. It has been changed a few times in the meantime, and this is a reflection of the changes that have been made up to this point.

The difference is in title II, which is where the reconciliation can take place. You will notice that it is a very simple title. There is not much to it. It requires that the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1 billion for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026. The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1 billion for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026. There is no specificity in this as to how the reconciliation will take place. That is up to the Finance Committee and the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee on the Senate side and the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Committee on Ways and Means on the House side to come up with the reconciliation bill, which has to pass a lot of Senate rules in order to be done, but you will notice that there isn't any specificity in here on how to do that.

That comes later. That will be another budget debate we will have, but it sets the stage so that can be done. Hopefully, it will be done quickly and we will be able to find solutions for the hard-working Americans whose experiences with ObamaCare are broken promises, higher costs, fewer choices. I hope our Democratic colleagues will join us in this effort so that we can come up with solutions so that Americans can afford the insurance they want and need.

I remember when we started this debate, I think there were 30 million people uninsured. Today, I think there are 30 million people uninsured. It is a different 30 million, though: The 30 million who couldn't get insurance now have insurance, and 30 million people who had insurance now can't afford their insurance. It is time for us to take care of both 30 millions and not just one. We will have that opportunity if we pass this concurrent resolution to fix ObamaCare.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. MIKE ENZI, the Senator from Wyoming, is a friend of mine. He comes from a beautiful rural State—Wyoming. I come from a beautiful rural State—Vermont. That is probably the end of our commonality. We look at the world very differently,

and I hope that in the course of this debate, the American people will see the very profound differences we have not only on health care, not only on tax policy, not only on the deficit, but on many other important issues.

What we are looking at right now is a budget process whose ultimate goal is to remove health insurance from tens of millions of Americans. Let's be clear. Today, the United States of America is the only major country on Earth that—I live 50 miles away from the Canadian border. Many of us have visited Europe. We are the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee health care to all people as a right. It is something I passionately believe in. I believe that health care for all is a human right. I had hoped we would work together to figure out what is a complicated issue as to how we can move forward to guarantee health care to all people in a cost-effective way, but that is not what we are debating today.

Let's be very clear. The Republican plan—their budget plan—lays the groundwork for ending the Affordable Care Act, which will remove tens of millions of Americans from the health insurance they get. There is nothing wrong with change. We can always improve.

I hope that during the course of this debate, my Republican friends who want to repeal the Affordable Care Act will come down and tell us what their plan is, how, in fact, they are going to provide quality, cost-effective health care to all Americans. Well, you know what. They all voted against the Affordable Care Act. Senator ENZI is right—we did not get one Republican to vote for it. They have had 8 years to think about how they are going to come up with a new plan, and I would hope but I do not expect one Republican to come to the floor and say: Oh yeah, we are going to throw 20, 30 million people out of their health insurance. This is our new plan. This is how we are going to provide health care to those people.

They have no ideas. Their theme is to repeal and then delay. Someday they are going to come up with a new plan. You don't destroy a house without having another house in which people can live. You don't throw 30 million people off of health care without having a plan to provide health care to those people.

Under the Republican proposal—something many Republicans have been talking about for years—they want to end Medicare as it presently exists, a program that is life-and-death for millions of seniors. They want to voucherize Medicare, give people a check, and then let them go to the private insurance market and get the best deal they can.

Imagine that you are an 85-year-old senior citizen who has been diagnosed with cancer and you get your check for whatever it may be. We don't know what it will be—\$7,000, \$8,000, \$9,000.

You go to the insurance company and you say: I have \$9,000. I am 85. I have been diagnosed with cancer. I want you to take care of me. Give me an insurance program that will take care of my medical needs, my hospital needs.

The insurance agent will laugh in your face because \$9,000 or \$8,000 will last you, at most, for 1 week.

That is their plan.

I have been all over the country, and right now the American people are outraged at the high cost of prescription drugs in this country—let's be clear—because of the power of the pharmaceutical industry and their lobbying and their campaign contributions—a power that exists, by the way, not only influencing Republicans but too many Democrats as well. We pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. In fact, one out of six Americans who goes to a doctor to get a prescription for an illness cannot even afford to fill the prescription. Yet, under the Republican proposal, if you eliminate the Affordable Care Act, the doughnut hole fix, which now helps seniors pay for their prescription drugs, will be eliminated and prescription drugs for seniors could rise by as much as 50 percent.

By the way, at a time when we have more income and wealth inequality than any other major country on Earth, when the very rich are getting richer while the middle class shrinks, the Republican proposal not only throws 20 to 30 million people off of health insurance, not only raises the price of prescription drugs for seniors, not only moves forward to privatize Medicare, but, shock of all shocks, our Republican colleagues want to give massive tax breaks to the top 2 percent.

Among many other negative impacts that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act will have will be one that will impact heavily rural States, such as Wyoming, Vermont, and other rural States around this country; that is, as a result of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, rural hospitals could be forced to close their doors—not getting the funding they need—leaving millions of Americans with nowhere to turn for critical medical care.

I look forward to this debate. Nobody here thinks the Affordable Care Act is perfect. Nobody believes that at all. The goal is how we repair it, how we improve it, how we expand health care to more Americans, how we end what has been the case for decades in this country—that we pay, by far, the highest prices in the world per capita for health care. Maybe we should understand that we are the only major country in the world that allows private insurance companies to profit off of people's illness.

The proposal being brought forth by the Republicans is not only poorly thought out, it really is not popular. It is not what the American people want. Go to your hometowns and ask people—at a time when the top one-tenth

of 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent, when the top 1 percent is earning 52 percent of all new income, go out and ask your constituents whether we should give huge tax breaks to the top 2 percent, and they don't think that is a good idea.

According to a poll released this month by POLITICO and Morning Consult, 80 percent of the American people think the Federal Government should be spending more money on Medicare. Only 10 percent think we should be spending less. Seventy-one percent of the American people think we should be spending more on Medicaid.

So 84 percent of the American people think the Federal Government should be spending more on Social Security. In other words, the proposal we are seeing from the Republicans today is way, way out of touch from where the American people are.

There is another issue out there that I find extremely interesting. Senator ENZI mentioned—and, of course, he is right—that within a couple of weeks we are going to have a new President. Donald Trump will be inaugurated as President, and it is interesting that we listened to what Donald Trump said during the campaign. The Democrats heard what he had to say during the campaign, what he campaigned on, and more importantly, Republicans, listened and heard what their leader had to say about these issues. This is what Donald Trump said, and he didn't say it once in the middle of the night. He didn't say it in an interview. This was a central part of his campaign. This is what he asked millions of elderly people and working-class people to vote for him on. These are the principles that Donald Trump ran and won the Presidency on. On May 7, 2015, Donald Trump tweeted: "I was the first and only potential GOP candidate to state there will be no cuts to social security, Medicare and Medicaid." On April 8, 2015, Mr. Trump said: "Every Republican wants to do a big number on Social Security." That is not BERNIE SANDERS talking; that is Donald Trump talking.

They want to do it on Medicare, they want to do it on Medicaid and we can't do it. It is not fair to the people that have been paying in for years.

That is not BERNIE SANDERS—Donald Trump, our soon-to-be President.

On March 29, 2016, Mr. Trump said:

You know, Paul [Ryan]—

PAUL RYAN is the Republican Speaker of the House—

wants to knock out Social Security, knock it down, way down. He wants to knock Medicare way down and frankly . . . you're going to lose the election if you're going to do that. I am not going to cut it, and I am not going to raise ages and I am not going to do all of the things they want to do, but they want to really cut it and they want to cut it very substantially, the Republicans, and I am going to do that."

What Mr. Trump said was exactly right. Here are the "they." This is the day. They want to cut Social Security.

They want to cut Medicare. They want to cut Medicaid. Mr. Trump was right, and millions of people voted for him on the belief that he would keep his word.

Well, it seems to me that Mr. Trump right now has to do one of two things. No. 1, if all that he was talking about was campaign rhetoric, then what he is obliged to do now is to tell the American people: I was lying. Yes, I said that I would not support cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, but I was lying. It was a campaign ruse. I just said what came to my mind to get votes. I have no intention of keeping my word. If that is what he believes, if that is what the case was, let him come forward and say that. But if that is not what the case is, if he was sincere, then I would hope that tomorrow or maybe today he could send out a tweet and tell his Republican colleagues to stop wasting their time and all of our time and for Mr. Trump to tell the American people that he will veto any proposal that cuts Medicare, that cuts Medicaid, and that cuts Social Security. What we are talking about right now—let us be clear: no debate. That is exactly what this goal is. That is what this budget proposal is. It is to move toward the voucherization and privatization of Medicare, to make massive cuts in Medicaid and throw millions of people off health insurance.

So there is a lot of responsibility on Mr. Trump's shoulders, but I would hope that he could save us a whole lot of time by telling the American people that he was sincere in what he said during the campaign, that he was not lying. If that is the case, we can end this discussion, get into the serious business of how we create a quality health care system guaranteeing health care to all people in a cost-effective way.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, there has been a flurry of activity this week with the beginning of the new year and the beginning of a new Congress—the 115th Congress—and we have a lot of work to do.

This election that we just went through on November 8 was surprising in many ways, gratifying in many ways. Personally, I think the best thing about it is that it gives us an opportunity to start anew, to deal with the problems that the American people were, frankly, not all that happy with either of the political parties about in terms of the solutions that we were to offer. I would hope that it would also give us an opportunity to hit the reset button when it comes to working together to try to find political consensus to solve some of these big problems.

I mentioned yesterday our friend, the chairman of the Budget Committee, and his 80-20 rule, which I told him I have used time and again to make the point that just because you disagree on some things doesn't mean you can't get

anything done. To the contrary, people of widely divergent ideological, philosophical, and political beliefs can work together by simply trying to find common ground. That is possible. That, in fact, is the way our Constitution created our government to force us to do that, because what we decide here impacts a lot of people—well over 300 million people in the United States alone. But if there was one consistent complaint that I heard from my constituents back in Texas and that we heard in the national media and beyond, it is about the failure of the promise of ObamaCare. We made a solemn commitment to the American people that if they provided us with the majority we needed to do it and if they provided us a President who would sign it, we would repeal ObamaCare and we would replace it with affordable health care that would be of their choosing, as opposed to a top-down mandate, a one-size-fits-all, which is the failure of ObamaCare.

In a previous life, I was attorney general of my State, the State of Texas. We had a huge division of trial lawyers called the consumer protection division. What we did is we sued people who committed consumer fraud—people who promised one thing but delivered another. I can't think of a bigger case of consumer fraud than ObamaCare, which was sold under false pretenses: If you like what you have, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. If you are a family of four, your premiums will go down by an average of \$2,500.

None of that has proven to be true.

The reason why ObamaCare is so unpopular is that people have seen their premiums skyrocket. People have seen their deductibles grow to the point where they are effectively self-insured, which is not having insurance at all. Many people have simply seen insurance companies pull out of the insurance market, leaving them with little or no choices in terms of where to buy their health care.

So many remember the PR campaign of the President and Democrats, with which they sold ObamaCare to the American people, and, as I said, promised better coverage, more choices, and lower prices.

That means now that ObamaCare has failed to deliver that. It is incumbent on us to try to repeal it, which we will do, and to replace it with more affordable coverage that people will choose and that fits their needs better. The bad news of ObamaCare picked up throughout last summer into the fall. As I mentioned, insurance companies were losing money and were unable to operate and deliver health care under the tight grip of ObamaCare. But the real losers weren't the insurance companies. It is the tens of thousands of Texans who were forced to find new insurance at higher prices—not insurance they would have chosen on their own, but which they were forced to accept because there was no alternative.

So instead of helping rural Texans—the Senator from Vermont talked about rural residents in his State—I would submit that for people living in rural areas across the country, the implementation of ObamaCare hurt most of our rural country by dwindling the number of choices to one health care option for the year. That sounds like the opposite of more choices and better coverage to me. But we can't forget that behind these numbers and headlines are real personal consequences for families across the country.

So today I want to provide just a snapshot of some of the thousands of letters that I received in my office about ObamaCare and the burdens that it is placing on the backs of the people I represent in Texas. One Texan wrote telling the story that I have heard time and again. She said her insurance plan was discontinued—so much for “if you like what you have, you can keep it.” But she did what she had to do, and she switched to a more expensive plan—one with a higher monthly payment and one with an \$11,000 deductible. What good is health insurance if you have to spend \$11,000 out of your own pocket before the insurance begins to kick in? It is nearly worthless.

Well, nothing about that says affordable health care. Unfortunately, this individual is like many folks across the country, full of questions and with nowhere to turn to find any relief for their families or their small business.

Another one of my constituents had a similar complaint. He wrote to me that he was searching for yet another health insurance plan for the third time in as many years after his was canceled. He went on to highlight this in this letter, which I received from a constituent on November 23, 2015. He said:

I seem to remember the President saying something about liking your insurance and being able to keep it. For myself and my family, it has been just the opposite. We loved our insurance prior to the passage of the Act and since have been forced to purchase much more expensive insurance with much higher deductibles.

Well, this Texan is right, but unfortunately, his experience was not isolated. It was shared by millions of people across the country for whom ObamaCare was a false promise. It is not as if he had the freedom to choose. The choice was made for him, and this was the fundamental flaw of ObamaCare. In a country as big and diverse as ours, this notion of “one-size-fits-all” and that somehow the people who live and work inside the beltway are smarter than the rest of us and we can figure out what is good for them and a choice they would not themselves make is just simply implausible. It is not true. This constituent ended his letter by asking the Congress:

Do anything. Do anything within your power to reverse this terrible health care trend. I need relief.

After this historic election, after the promises we made that have given us

the opportunity to govern in the majority, with a President in the White House who will work with us, I believe we have a clear mandate to repeal this terrible law and make it a relic of the past. We will do that by adopting the budget resolution submitted by Chairman ENZI of the Budget Committee.

It is not just Republicans who have pointed out the defects of ObamaCare. Many of our Democratic colleagues have pointed out the law's failed promises as well—from an op-ed entitled “How to fix the Affordable Health Care Act,” which was written by a Democrat, to statements on the Senate floor, to legislation introduced to “fix the glitch.” Even in campaign ads, many of our Democratic colleagues have themselves been outspoken advocates for changing ObamaCare. The senior Senator from Missouri, pointing out the “huge problem ObamaCare has been in her State” came up with an entire list of necessary changes. I, for one, would be happy to start with her list and say let's try to use this as a core of issues that we can then try to build consensus around to begin to make that replacement and make it on a bipartisan basis.

We have seen that attempted fixes, unsupported by the Obama administration and vastly insufficient, continually have been met with frustration by Democrats and Republicans. I pointed out yesterday that when the Democrats voted through ObamaCare, they had 60 votes. They had 60 Senators. Today they have 48.

At one point, certainly back in 2009 and 2010 when ObamaCare passed, they had a majority in the House of Representatives. Well, they lost that. Now they have lost the White House itself. I just don't know how much longer, how much more needs to be said or done for them to get the message that this is not working because I believe they are paying a political price for it as people are searching for accountability for what they have to deal with day in and day out.

The senior Senator from Indiana said that he supported the Affordable Care Act to help working and middle-class families have access to health care, but he said that doesn't mean the law is perfect, and it doesn't mean we don't still have work to do.

I was delighted to hear the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS, say he agrees ObamaCare is not perfect. My request of him and others is to work with us to try to replace it with something better.

I recognize that neither side is going to be able to get everything they want. That is just not the way this place works. Indeed, the single failure of the Obama administration is to try to do things on a go-it-alone basis because we are going to see those Executive orders that he issued unilaterally rescinded on the first day President-Elect Trump takes office. All the massive regulations that have been issued, we are going to use the Congressional



Review Act to rein those in or to defund those through the appropriations process. In order for legislation and policy to be sustainable, it is going to have to be bipartisan. I realize our Democratic colleagues are disappointed with the outcome of the election on November 8. That is an understatement. At first they started out in denial: It just can't be true. The next stage was met with anger. Well, they are angry about it, and they are going to obstruct everything the new majority, working with the White House, tries to do, but I would hope they would move past that denial and past that anger and do what the Senate was always designed to do; that is, to work on a bipartisan basis, as our friend and colleague from Wyoming demonstrated to us working on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee with the liberal lion of the Senate, Teddy Kennedy. Let's try the 80-20 rule and see how it works. It will work.

The senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. MANCHIN—this is another Democrat—has said he would vote to repeal ObamaCare. He said that we should be working together to identify which parts of the law are broken and need to be fixed. We may learn that some parts of the law can't be repaired and we should eliminate those parts entirely. This is our Democratic friend and colleague from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN.

I think that is a great place to start because no matter which side of the aisle you sit on, you can see the Affordable Care Act is not working, certainly not as sold to the American people. The choice of the Democrats now is whether to obstruct or whether they will actually work with us, as we should have done in the first place, to come up with something more sustainable that would address costs and preserve individual choice.

It is interesting. It is not just our Democratic colleagues, many of whom voted for ObamaCare. I remember during the Presidential campaign that former President Bill Clinton made some pretty interesting comments. This would have been on October 5, 2016. I am reading from a CNN story here. It said:

Speaking at a Democratic rally in Flint, Michigan, the former president ripped the Affordable Care Act (ACA) for flooding the health care insurance market and causing premiums to rise for middle-class Americans who do not qualify for subsidies.

Here is what he said:

So you've got this crazy system where all of a sudden 25 million more people have health care and then the people who are out there busting it, sometimes 60 hours a week, wind up with their premiums doubled and their coverage cut in half. It's the craziest thing in the world.

Former President Bill Clinton said that in Flint, MI, on October 5, 2016.

He is right, but that is what you get when you try to do things in a partisan, unilateral fashion. We should learn from our collective mistakes and

try to do better, and shame on us if we can't do better than ObamaCare with all of its failed promises.

By repealing ObamaCare, Congress is doing more than just delivering on a promise we made to the people who put us here. We are providing a way forward for millions of people across the country who have been hurt by ObamaCare and are looking for relief.

I look forward to making ObamaCare and the many burdens it has placed on American families a thing of the past in this new year. That is what we will do when next week we pass this budget resolution, and then reconciliation instructions will be sent to the relevant Senate and House committees. They will then report back with the replacement, and, yes, it may take some time to transition into that replacement because it has taken us 6 years to get into the mess, into the ditch we find ourselves in now. When your truck or car is in the ditch, the first thing you need to do is get out of the ditch. Sometimes that takes a lot of hard work.

We are going to have to work as hard as we can. I would hope our colleagues will work with us, not just to resist for resistance's sake, not just to take a partisan position because they feel they are required to do so because of their allegiance to the policies of the Democratic Party. Let's do what this institution has always been best known for; that is, to try to find some way to work together on a step-by-step basis to produce reform which will make health care more affordable and still preserve those choices for individuals and their families, not a one-size-fits-all government mandate which simply has failed in this tragic experiment known as ObamaCare. We can and we will do better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first let me comment on what my friend, the distinguished Senator from Texas, said. If my car goes into a ditch, the first thing I don't do is dismantle the car. That doesn't help me get anywhere in terms of transportation.

First of all, let me speak on process before talking about the substance of what we are really talking about and how it affects people. We have a bill in front of us that creates a process for the majority to be able to unravel and repeal essentially our whole health care system. You pull a thread and it goes through not only employer-based care, patient protections, people who have insurance, Medicare, Medicaid. All of it begins to unravel. Interestingly, also in this bill, in the text it adds \$1 trillion to the deficit—\$1 trillion to the deficit in the bill that our colleagues just voted to proceed to pass.

We need to be very clear on this: If colleagues want to work with us to fix problems and improve health care, we can start this afternoon. It is almost

3:30. By 4 o'clock we could put together a group of people. I am sure our distinguished Democratic leader on the Budget Committee would be happy to sit down and work together on ways to make health care reform better and make health care more affordable and make it more available to people. If that is what we want to do, count us in, but that is not what we are talking about here. We are talking about this crazy idea that no one in their real life would do.

It is like deciding you want a new house, so you tear down the old house. That is the easy part. Then your family is homeless. Then you say: Well, gosh, you know, maybe I better have a plan to get a new house for my family and figure out a way to pay for it, to be able to afford it.

Nobody would do that. Nobody would start by saying: We are going to rip apart the entire health care system and create chaos. We are going to undermine Medicare. We are going to undermine Medicaid. We are going to take away patient protections for everybody who has insurance through their employer, and then we will figure out later what we are going to do to replace it, if anything.

I know there is a division on the Republican side. Certainly Members in the House don't think it should even be replaced at all.

It is interesting. We are talking about one-sixth of the economy that would be destabilized. There is no question that if you do a repeal and insurance companies don't know what is coming—I have talked to hospitals, and they don't know what is coming—behavior will begin to change. Rates will begin to go up. Different decisions will be made because, as businesses, they will not know how to plan. Their investors will not know how to plan.

There is no question about it. When you repeal without creating certainty in the marketplace, you begin a process that results in chaos.

We have an interesting example, one that I have been involved with for a lot of years, where we wanted to change just one piece of the health care system, the reimbursement system for doctors.

I was in the House when they passed Medicare changes. We put in place a new policy. We were going to write a new policy to reimburse physicians for quality instead of quantity. It makes sense. It took 18 years to get agreement. We got agreement last year. It doesn't even take effect for 4 years.

Everybody here knows about this thing called the doc fix. It is an inside term—or SGR, which is even more insider. The truth is, we were trying to change just one thing and could not get agreement to do it for 18 years.

Anyone who thinks that there is going to be a repeal without an ACA extender going on has not looked at past processes.

What is most important, though, is what this means to real people. This



really is about a plan of ripping apart the health care system. There is nothing in its place immediately so we don't even know what will be coming. This is going to make America sick again.

We are talking about a process and a plan that for real people is not a political game. It is not smoke and mirrors. It shouldn't be about politics. It is about the moms and dads who go to bed at night and say: Please, God, don't let the kids get sick. Now, many of them—close to 30 million counting everybody with new coverage—don't have to say that. They can say a different kind of prayer because they can go see the doctor.

We know that when you unravel that system with nothing responsible in its place, we are talking about making America sick again. We want affordable care, not chaos. This plan goes from affordable care to chaos. We talk about some parts of what we passed in health reform, but there are a lot of things we don't emphasize that I think are important to recognize in this debate.

First of all, what we pass in terms of changes in quality care affects every single American with health insurance. A lot of people in my State are fortunate to have employer-based insurance. We have a lot of folks at the collective bargaining table fighting every year to make sure they keep their insurance—150 million people across the country. All of them have benefited from the patient protections we put into health reform. When we take those away, then immediately the insurance companies will be back in charge. If you get sick, you can get dropped. Right now they can't do that. If you are sick or if your child is sick, right now you can't be blocked from buying insurance. We call it a preexisting condition. But before health reform, insurance companies were doing that every single day—a child with juvenile diabetes, someone with cancer or Alzheimer's disease.

I think about a very good friend of mine who just found out her grandson has leukemia. He is 2 years old. He is going through treatment. We pray he is going to be able to get through it successfully. He is going to have a preexisting condition for the rest of his life. With this repeal, there is no guarantee he will ever be able to get insurance. On top of that, if he has to have treatments that go on for some period of time, caps will be reinstituted on the amount of care you can get, the amount of treatment per year, dollar amount, or amount of visits you can get, and there is no guarantee that this little boy will be able to get the treatment he needs so that he can live a healthy, successful life going forward.

In talking with pediatric cancer doctors a couple of weeks ago, it was so amazing and gratifying to me to hear them talk about children whose lives have been extended, whose quality of life has been extended because of the fact that they are able to fully treat

these children and insurance companies can't put caps on how much they will pay or how many treatments. Now there is a whole other range of protections for everybody.

One of the fights I was proud to lead in the Finance Committee when we passed the ACA was to make sure that the basic insurance package every company has to provide has to include maternity care. That seems like a no-brainer. People were shocked that it didn't. Before we passed health reform, 70 percent of the insurance companies—the policies you buy in the private market didn't include maternity care. In fact, women were viewed as having a preexisting condition because they might get pregnant, might have a baby. That is not true anymore. Women are not rated differently than men, and maternity care is now available regardless of the kind of insurance you have. That is a pretty good deal. Right now I have a son and a daughter with growing families, and I can tell you that is a very big deal in my family.

There is a whole range of things. We all know about young people who are able to stay on their parents' insurance. They get out of college and they are wrestling with a huge debt, and one thing they don't have to worry about is whether they can stay on their parents' insurance until they can find a job. That goes away with repeal.

Something I care deeply about is mental health. We have all worked together on opioids and substance abuse treatment. Because of what we did in health care reform, insurance companies cannot discriminate if it is mental health or substance abuse treatment rather than physical health treatment. Prior to what we passed, they could charge much higher copays, higher premiums, but not anymore. So the whole body—above the neck as well as below the neck—is now being treated equally with our insurance reforms.

So there are a multitude of things—preventive health services with no copays, such as cancer screenings for mammograms and contraception. I was talking to someone who said she thought it was so wonderful that her drugstore wasn't charging her for copays anymore on her contraception. I said: Well, you know, that is actually the law. That was changed when we passed the Affordable Care Act.

So there is a whole range of things that relate to reviewing premium increases, if you get removed from your insurance, you have the right to appeal. There is a whole range of things. So that is under the first step. Everybody will feel it when insurance companies are back in charge and, through this vote and the subsequent actions, patient protections are repealed for everybody.

Secondly, this includes cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Through what we did in health reform, we closed the gap on the high costs of prescription drugs. We called it the doughnut hole. That

was in the process of being closed. If you have a lot of medicines and a lot of costs, you suddenly get to a point where there is a gap in coverage and you have to pay the full cost. That goes away and the doughnut hole comes back.

What we did added 12 years of solvency to the Medicare trust fund to keep it strong longer. That goes away. Wellness visits for seniors—every year they are able to go in and get a physical without a copay—that goes away. So Medicare is undermined. Then, unfortunately, when you add the incoming nominee as Secretary of Health and Human Services and couple that with the proposals that the Speaker has had and others that I am sure we are going to see to turn Medicare into a voucher—you go into the private market. Here is your voucher. Good luck. That is part of what the new regime is promoting, which only adds to this.

Eighty percent of Medicaid spending is seniors in nursing homes. And we know that the majority of those who—many who have gotten care, in addition to the exchanges, have been folks who have been working hard every single day in minimum wage jobs and who couldn't afford or find insurance before. Now they are covered if their State or their Governor is willing to do that. We have a whole bunch of folks who are working hard every day at minimum wage who at least know they have access to health care and a doctor.

Interestingly, this helps our hospitals, whether they are rural hospitals upstate or up north in Michigan or whether they are our great urban hospitals, safety net hospitals in Detroit and other areas, instead of people walking into the emergency room and not having insurance and having the cost put on everybody who does. Because of the Medicaid expansion, when a working person comes in with Medicaid, they are able to pay for their own care rather than having everybody else with insurance carry the brunt of that, which is the way it was prior to that.

So there are Medicare and Medicaid cuts.

Next, we do know that altogether, counting Medicaid and people using the new exchanges, we have about 30 million people who will be kicked off of their insurance, folks who, like anybody else, want to have health insurance for their families. Can we design that in a better way? I would love to work with you on that. I am not going to kick them off first. I don't want to say: We are going to rip your insurance away. We are going to rip the small businesses I have talked to—rip their insurance away. And then, by the way, don't worry, further down the road we will figure out something else. We don't know what it is, we don't know what it will cost, but trust me.

I wouldn't be trusting that would happen if I were counting on that for my insurance.

The fourth item is that there is no question that costs will go up by destabilizing the marketplace. We know the cost of prescription drugs will go up as a result of taking away the extra help for prescription drugs. There is no question that costs are going to go up for everybody else who has insurance.

When we look at this, I don't know how anybody looking at this outside of a political lens or a rigid ideological lens could say this makes any sense. It doesn't make any sense.

We have a President-elect who is coming in who said that he would not do anything to hurt Medicare or Medicaid or Social Security. Yet the first thing on the floor definitely undermines Medicare and Medicaid. We have a President-elect who said he wants to bring down the cost of prescription drugs. Yet, by undermining Medicare prescription drug coverage, those prices are going to go up. People who have the most medical needs and need the most medicine are going to see their costs go up.

What would be better would be if the new incoming HHS Secretary would be given the ability to negotiate through Medicare for prescription drugs—something we have all fought for, for a long time. Let's allow drug reimportation. Our leader on the budget—and I have as well—put seniors on buses in the past to demonstrate the differences in cost across the bridge between Windsor and Detroit, the cost of the same drug, with the very same safety provisions. That would bring down costs. Taking away Medicare coverage and increasing the gap in coverage is exactly the wrong thing to be doing if, in fact, the incoming President really means it when he says he wants to bring down drug prices.

So there are a number of things we care deeply about on health care. As someone who has worked on this for years—in fact, it was health care and health policy that first got me into politics, leading an effort to save a nursing home in my community. I care deeply about this. I am one of the folks way down deep in the weeds on this. But we don't improve a health system by ripping it out by its roots, by undermining the whole system without figuring out what comes next. That only happens if you really don't care what comes next because if you care, that is not a responsible position.

So, Mr. President, and my colleagues, I feel very strongly that with everything we know that has been made available to strengthen quality, to give people back their own decisionmaking instead of the insurance companies on basics like providing care for themselves and their families, the strengthening of Medicare and Medicaid, the coverage that has been made available, we know there is a way to work together to make things better, and this is not it.

Mr. SANDERS. Will my colleague from Michigan yield for a moment?

Ms. STABENOW. I will be happy to.

Mr. SANDERS. I want to thank my colleague for her very thoughtful presentation talking about the implications of simply repealing ObamaCare.

The assumption that many of my colleagues seem to start from is that before ObamaCare, the health care system was great in America, that everybody had health care in a cost-effective way and then ObamaCare came along and all of these problems arose.

What the Senator from Michigan just told us—and I want people to remember it—8 years ago, if you were diagnosed with cancer and you walked into an insurance company, they would say: Why would we give you insurance? We will lose money on you. Your cancer may recur.

You are a woman and you want maternity coverage? What do you think is going on? Why should we do that?

You are a family with a kid who is 21 years of age and you want his insurance on your policy? Well, you couldn't have it.

I think what the Senator from Michigan pointed out is not that anyone thinks the Affordable Care Act is perfect—nobody thinks it doesn't need improvement. But to simply throw out all of the benefits, for 30 million people to be thrown off of health insurance—during the budget hearings a couple of years ago that Senator ENZI chaired, I asked a question of my colleagues when this idea came up, and I would ask it again to my good friend from Wyoming. What are the studies you have seen in terms of the number of people who will die when they lose their health insurance? How many thousands of people will die because they no longer have health insurance and they cannot go to the doctor and the hospital? The studies I have seen suggest that many thousands of people will die. That is common sense. If you throw 30 million people off of health insurance, they are going to die. How do you go forward providing a death penalty to thousands of people without having any solution to it?

Further, I would add to the excellent points made by the Senator from Michigan. Senator ENZI and the Senator from Texas before him talked about the impact of health care problems in rural areas. I come from a rural area. Michigan has large parts of the State that are rural. The Senators from rural areas on the Republican side have said they want to make sure their constituents in rural areas can see a doctor. That is certainly a modest proposal. Of course they should be able to see a doctor.

If that is the case, my Republican friends should understand what the Federation of American Hospitals and the American Hospital Association said about repealing the Affordable Care Act. These are major hospital organizations. According to a very recent report, what they said is that a repeal of the Affordable Care Act will mean a reduction in payments to rural hospitals of over \$165 billion over a 10-year pe-

riod. According to the hospital associations, rural hospitals will suffer an additional loss of \$289 billion from their inflation updates.

This is a report from the Federation of American Hospitals and the American Hospital Association, major health care institutions in America. They said in their report: "This reversal of health coverage would represent an unprecedented public health crisis." Furthermore, they said: "The magnitude of reductions would threaten hospitals' ability to serve patients."

So when we talk about the needs of rural Americans, I would hope my colleagues listen to what the Federation of American Hospitals and the American Hospital Association have to say.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the more things change, the more they seem to stay the same. Republicans won the White House. Republicans control the Senate. Republicans control the House. What will the first order of business be for the new Republican majority? To pass a budget that never balances, to pass a budget that will add \$9.7 trillion of new debt over 10 years.

Is that really what we campaigned on? Is that really what the Republican Party represents?

Our first order of business will be a budget that never balances, a budget that adds \$9.7 trillion to the debt, and they tell us: Oh, but it is not a budget. If you listen, they will say: No, no, it is a vehicle to repeal ObamaCare.

Yet I have the title in front of me, which says a concurrent resolution for the budget of 2017. We have special rules when you pass the budget so that we may be able to repeal ObamaCare, and I am all for that. But why should we vote on a budget that doesn't represent our conservative view? Why would we vote on a budget that adds \$9.7 trillion to the debt? Because we are in a hurry, we can't be bothered.

It is just numbers. I was told again and again: Swallow it. Take it. They are just numbers. Don't worry. It is not really a budget.

Yet the legislation says it is a budget. The numbers say we will add \$9.7 trillion of new debt.

So I say: If they are only numbers, and if the numbers that are in the budget don't matter, why don't we put numbers in that balance? Why don't we put a vision into the budget that represents what Republicans say they are for?

Republicans say they are the conservative party. Are we? When George W. Bush was President for 8 years, the national debt went from \$5 trillion to \$10 trillion. The debt doubled under a Republican President and a partially Republican Congress. Yet the words were these: Well, he had Democrats to deal with, and if we could ever take all three branches of government, things would be different.

The Republicans took over the House in 2010. They still didn't control the

Senate, but they said: If we only controlled the Senate, we could be the conservative party again.

We have had an election. The conservative party—the supposedly conservative party—won. Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, and the first item of business for the Republicans will be to pass a budget that never balances—a budget that will add \$9.7 trillion to the debt over 10 years.

This sign could have been put up for Obama's first budget. Every Republican railed and said: \$10 trillion—President Obama will add \$10 trillion. And he did. President Obama doubled the debt again.

It went from \$5 trillion to \$10 trillion. The national debt went from \$5 trillion to \$10 trillion under George W. Bush, and then it doubled again under President Obama. It went from \$10 trillion to nearly \$20 trillion.

What are we looking at here? More debt, under a solidly unified Republican Congress and a Republican President.

So you might scratch your head and say: The more things change, the more they stay the same. Is it all smoke and mirrors? Is there really a difference? Are Republicans different than Democrats? It is a pretty important question. We are in such a hurry to repeal ObamaCare. I am all for it. As a physician, nobody thinks that ObamaCare has been worse for the country. Nobody more than me thinks it is a terrible piece of legislation that has not helped the country and that has inflated our costs and not helped. Yet do we have to add nearly \$10 trillion of debt in order to get at it?

So as this moves forward, I will offer a replacement. I will offer my own budget. I will offer to strike and remove \$10 trillion worth of debt, and I will offer my own budget that balances within 5 years. How do we do it? We give the authority to make the cuts where they should be, where they are most wasteful in government, and we offer this budget by simply freezing expenditures. You don't have to cut any expenditures.

Every department of government could get what they got the last year. If you think some departments of government need more money, cut other departments of government. Frankly, there are some departments of government you could eliminate and you would never know they were gone. If the Department of Commerce were gone, a few corporate executives would not be able to fly around on government jets. They could fly around on their own jets. You would never know the whole entire Department of Commerce was gone.

You can cut spending. You can actually get to the balance by not cutting anything. So here is what happens. If you freeze the on-budget spending, within a little over 5 years, your budget balances.

I remember a time when there were the moderates who were for freezing

spending, and the real conservatives were for cutting spending. Now nobody is for cutting spending. When I bring it up that you can absolutely not balance the budget if you are not willing to look at entitlements, do you know what I am told by many well-meaning Republicans? Don't write it down. Don't put it on paper because people will be upset with you if you explain that to save Social Security, to save Medicare, you will have to reform these entitlement programs. They say: Let's just talk about waste. Let's just talk about fraud and abuse. And I do, and we should eliminate all of those. But guess what. If you eliminate all of the budgetary spending that we vote on—this is called the discretionary spending. This would be the military and all the rest of the nonmilitary. It is about \$1 trillion, not including the entitlements—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. If you did just the military and the nonmilitary and you reduced it 10 percent a year for 10 years, and you virtually wiped out all discretionary spending, you still don't balance the budget.

So, really, you are not a conservative if you are not willing to look at all government spending. The budget cannot be balanced and the budget will never balance unless we look at entitlements.

What does that mean? It means that because of demographics—we had big families 60 years ago, with three, four, five kids to a family. Now we have less than three kids to a family—probably two kids to a family. So you had all the baby boomers born right after World War II, and they are all retiring—60 million of them. So we have this huge population boom, and you don't have as many workers. So the demographics aren't working. Then you add to that the fact that we are living longer.

When Social Security was started, the average life expectancy was 65. It worked pretty well as a pension plan because you died. But now it is great. We are living on average to 80, and if you make 80, you may well make 90. What a great thing—longevity. But it is not working. Social Security is not working. We spend more on recipients than we bring in with the tax.

Medicare is even worse. The average taxpayer pays about \$100,000 over their lifetime in Medicare taxes. The average recipient takes out \$350,000. How big a problem is this? Medicare is \$35 trillion to \$40 trillion in the whole.

It is inexcusable that we are not talking about how we fix Medicare. It is inexcusable that we are not talking about how to fix Social Security. If we don't fix them, there is going to be a cliff. Within about a decade, the cliff is so severe that everyone on Social Security will suffer a 20-percent decline in their monthly check. It will happen all at once if we don't fix it. Can we fix it? Yes, we have to talk about it.

What we are doing today is kicking the can down the road. We have our

focus on ObamaCare, but we are taking our focus off the debt. As bad a problem as ObamaCare is, as much as it has disturbed, destroyed, and distorted the health care market, it may be that the debt is a bigger problem.

So it is not a popular stand that I take today. I will be the only Republican to vote against the Republican budget. That won't be popular. But I ran for office. I left my medical practice. I am away from my family. I spend long hours traveling here because I am concerned about the debt.

We borrow \$1 million a minute. The debt threatens the very foundation of our country. Yet here we are. The Republican Party controls the House, the Senate, and the White House, and in their haste, they put forward a budget that is going to add this much debt.

This is what the debt has been doing. Here is 1980. We see the growth. It has become exponential—the growth of the debt. This should worry every American. But here is the Republican 10-year budget that we are getting ready to pass. It is virtually a vertical line of accumulation of debt.

People will say: But how could we ever cut any spending? I will give you a couple of examples of where your government spends money and you tell me whether or not we ought to look long and hard at cutting spending.

There was a grant given for autism. I have a great deal of sympathy. I know children with autism. The grant was for \$700,000. But do you know what they spent it on? They spent it on studying Neil Armstrong's statement. Remember Neil Armstrong? He landed on the moon and said: "That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

Well, your government, in its infinite wisdom, wanted to know: Did he say "one small step for man" or "one small step for a man"? Your government spent \$700,000 studying the preposition "a." Did he say "a man" or just "man"—\$700,000. Money that should have been spent on autism was spent on something frivolous.

Is anybody going to fix it? No. Every year, all of the spending bills are globbed together in a 2,000-page bill—and not one iota of reform.

My colleagues may remember that Senator Proxmire from the 1970s used to have something called the "Golden Fleece Award." Every one of those things he complained about in the 1970s happens now but tenfold greater. Nobody fixes it. We don't pass individual spending bills. We do continuing resolutions, which means we continue doing the same thing we have done over and over.

Again, \$700,000 was spent studying Neil Armstrong's statement. Do you know what their conclusion was? We are not sure. They spent \$700,000, and they are still not sure whether he said "a man" or "one small step for man."

We spent \$500,000 studying whether or not, when you take a selfie, if you are smiling in the selfie, does it ultimately make you feel better? We spent \$500,000.

So what do we do? Do we give these people less money? Teach them a lesson. Give them less money, and maybe they will conserve the money. Maybe they will eliminate waste if they have less money next year than they had this year—or what I am proposing: Freeze the spending. Is anybody proposing that? No. We say: They spend a half a million dollars on selfies; give them more next year.

So the Republican budget will increase spending every year. It increases spending at about 5 percent a year. So spending goes up. They say it is the baseline, and they say we are cutting off the baseline. No, no. The baseline goes up 5 percent a year. Spending will increase over the 10-year period. The red line is spending.

Part of that is what the Republicans are proposing. They are going to stay on the spending curve. If we stay on the spending curve, they will continue to spend \$700,000 studying Neil Armstrong's statement; they will continue to spend half a million dollars on selfies. They spent another half a million dollars on a climate change game. They spent \$45 million to build a natural gas station in Afghanistan—\$45 million. The first problem: Nobody in Afghanistan has a car that runs on natural gas. They discovered this after they built the gas station. The gas station was 86 times cost overrun. The original estimate was about half a million for the gas station, but lo and behold, somehow it cost \$45 million. If your government had 86 times cost overrun, would you give them more money or give them less money? I, frankly, think we should give them less money. If you give them more money, they will not waste it less; they will waste it the same or worse. They should be given less money.

Mazar-e Sharif is a city in northern Afghanistan. We built an \$85 million embassy there and we signed a 10-year lease, and then somebody looked at the place and decided that since there were tall buildings surrounding the entire entity, people would shoot down into the courtyard and kill our diplomats, and they said the building could never been occupied—after they spent 85 billion, after they signed a 10-year lease. How will they get better? Were the people who made this decision fired? No. They are Federal employees, and you never fire Federal employees. Will they make wiser decisions because we give them less money? No. We give them more money.

You would be excused for being upset if you went and voted and said "I am going to vote for the conservative party" and if you went and voted and said "I am going to vote for the party that is going to balance a budget." Wouldn't you be upset? Wouldn't you wonder which party that is?

This is the spending curve. We are going to add \$9.7 trillion in 10 years, and yet they say: Oh, no, this isn't really a budget.

I have it in front of me, though. It is a budget.

There is no reason why Republicans couldn't have put forward a budget that doesn't add all the red ink. We are at \$20 trillion. We are going to nearly \$30 trillion under the Republican plan. My goodness, what happened? Where is the conservative party? Where are the conservatives in Congress who would say enough is enough? Now they say: We just have to be done with this. Don't distract the little people. Don't let the people of the country know we are voting on a budget. We are going to call this the vehicle to repeal ObamaCare.

Well, that is not what it is. It is a budget. And we have special rules for dealing with the budget that allow us to repeal ObamaCare, which I am all for, but this is a budget.

They say: Well, how can we get the votes? No Democrats will vote for this budget. This is a Republican blueprint. Not one Democrat will vote for this.

So this is what Republicans are for. This is the blueprint the Republican Party says they are for—\$10 trillion worth of new debt. I am not for it. That is not why I ran for office. That is not why I am here. That is not why I spend time away from my family and my medical practice. It is because debt is consuming our country. There is a time and a place to debate ObamaCare, and I am more than willing to debate that. But this is a budget. This is the vote on a budget.

They say: Oh, it is just a gimmick. It is just a game. The numbers don't mean anything.

Well, if the numbers don't mean anything, put honest numbers in there or put conservative numbers in there.

I, for one, will put forward a conservative opposition to the Republican majority's budget. I will put forward a budget that freezes spending and balances the budget over a 5-year period. Would there be some agencies that would get less money? Yes. But it would force us to go through the government and pick and choose what is good spending and what is not good spending.

We have a waste report that we put out. If you look on our Facebook, you can find our waste report. I listed four or five of the most egregious. There are hundreds and hundreds, if not thousands, of things we shouldn't be spending money on. I will give another example.

We have sold \$100 billion worth of weapons to Saudi Arabia. They were wanting to spend money giving F-16s to Pakistan. You pay for them and give them to them.

There is riddled throughout the Pentagon—look, the Pentagon has never been audited. You are surprised? The government has never been audited. The Federal Reserve is not audited. The Pentagon is not audited. So what is the Pentagon's response to being audited? The Pentagon says to us: We are too big to be audited. I don't know about you, but that makes me kind of angry, that a part of our government,

even a necessary part such as national defense, says they are too big to be audited. Meanwhile, we have \$85 million embassies built that will never be occupied and \$45 million gas stations that will never be used.

I think it is time that we say enough is enough. Don't give government more money; give them less. The government hasn't been a good steward of your money.

The question is often asked: Are the people who spend your money, are the people involved in government inherently stupid? It is kind of a debatable question. I think they are mostly well-intentioned. I don't think they are inherently stupid, but I do think they don't get the right incentives. Because there is no profit motive in government, because there is no rationale or motive to conserve, money is spent, and because of sheer laziness and ineptitude, we continue to pass the spending bills—glommed together, thousands of pages—without reform. But I won't be party to that. I won't vote for spending bills that are not individualized and don't have reforms in them. I won't vote for budgets that never balance.

So while I may be a lonely voice on this issue, I will continue to bring up to the American people that it is important not to add more debt, that it is important to slow down the accumulation of debt. It is important that we have a \$20 trillion debt, and I am not willing to add \$10 trillion more in debt. So at the appropriate time, I will introduce an amendment that will strike and replace this budget, and in its place I will put forward a conservative vision for the country—a vision of a balanced budget that balances within 5 years.

Every Republican in the Congress who has been here for a while has voted for a balanced budget amendment. Interestingly, the balanced budget amendment—which would be an amendment to the Constitution—has within it a provision that the budget would balance within 5 years. And even when Republicans get around to saying "Oh, we will have some gimmicks to balance in 10," 10 is not what the amendment says. Why bother voting on an amendment if you are not serious about it?

Republicans are completely in charge. It is a Republican document; it is a document I disagree with; and at the appropriate time, I will be introducing a replacement that will balance within 5 years and provide a conservative view for the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are discussing the budget resolution. It is an interesting time to do it in the month of January. The fiscal year, the spending year for the Federal Government, starts October 1. We have tried, with no success, to pass appropriations bills—12 of them—that would meet our obligation to fund the government for the entire fiscal year. We have had two continuing resolutions, which are temporary spending bills. And here we are again discussing a budget resolution.

But it isn't really about the budget; it is about the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare, a law passed 6 years ago with the goal of providing affordable health insurance for all Americans. I voted for that bill. It is one of the most important bills I have ever voted for, and I believe that, despite shortcomings, it has achieved its goal and it has done it in a way that most American families would agree they want to see.

As an example, there are very few families in America who have every member of the family in perfect health. In the old days before the Affordable Care Act, if you happened to have a child who had survived a cancer situation, a spouse with diabetes, and you went to buy a health insurance plan, you ran into a problem: They might not want to insure your family because of that sick child, or they might want to charge you a premium way beyond your reach. So in the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, we said: As a health insurance company, you cannot sell insurance in America and discriminate against a family or person because of a preexisting medical condition.

From where I am sitting, my own personal life experience and my family's experience, thank goodness. We had members of our family with serious health issues. I worried about that all the time as a husband, as a father. The Affordable Care Act gave me and every other American the peace of mind that health insurance companies could not discriminate against us or our families because of a preexisting condition.

There was also a practice where they would put a limit on how much coverage you could buy in a health insurance policy. So many people thought: I have a great health insurance policy. It has a \$100,000 limit. I will never hit that number; I am a healthy person.

The next accident, the next diagnosis, and that healthy person realized that \$100,000 in today's world of health care costs—you could eat that up in a minute and find yourself without any health insurance protection. What happens to you next?

You have been diagnosed with cancer. You start treatment. It is expensive, and now your health insurance

policy has reached a point where it doesn't cover you anymore. What then are your options? Stop treatment? Exhaust your savings? Throw yourself on the mercy of a hospital and hope for the best?

We ended that. ObamaCare ended that. They can no longer put limits on health insurance policies because none of us—not one of us—knows what kind of health crisis we might face or a member of our family might face tomorrow. That is important.

A third provision in ObamaCare, which most families would understand in a hurry, involved what to do with that recent college graduate. What are you going to do with that daughter whose graduation you are so proud to go to, and then it dawns on you that she doesn't have a full-time job yet and that the part-time job she has doesn't have any health insurance benefits.

I remember calling my daughter and saying to her: Jennifer, I know you had health insurance as a student. What is your situation now?

Oh, Dad, I am fine. I am healthy. I am not worried.

I am worried, as a father, something is going to happen to her and she will have no health insurance protection.

Do you know what ObamaCare did? ObamaCare said I could keep my daughter under my family health insurance plan until she reached the age of 26. Peace of mind for 2, 3, 4 years while that son or daughter is starting their professional life, their life of employment. For thousands in Illinois and across the United States, more peace of mind that health insurance would be there when your family really needed it.

We also said we don't think you ought to discriminate against people when you sell them health insurance just because, for example, you happen to be a woman. Yes, the health insurance premiums charged women were higher than those for men. Obviously, women can have challenges in their lives but so can men. We said you cannot discriminate in health insurance premiums under ObamaCare between men and women.

These are issues that affect the real world—what people pay for insurance, whether they qualify for insurance, and whether insurance will be there when you need it. That is what ObamaCare did. By providing helping hands to those in lower and middle-income categories, we extended the reach of health insurance under ObamaCare to cover 20 to 30 million more Americans. We currently have the highest percentage of Americans with health insurance in modern history.

We had another provision too. We said: If you happen to be a senior citizen under Medicare and you are paying for your prescription drugs, that can be expensive. Under the old law, before ObamaCare, there was a gap in coverage, and you might spend \$1,000 or \$2,000 out of your savings account each year just to keep taking your meds. We

closed the gap so you had continuous coverage under Medicare as a senior.

Important? You bet it is. A lot of seniors ended up retired with limited savings wanting their meds, their prescriptions, so they can remain strong and independent as long as possible. Don't we want them to? So that, in a brief summary, will contain four or five of the main features of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act—more Americans with the guarantee of health insurance than any time in our modern history in the United States of America.

How important is it to have health insurance? If you have ever been the father of a very sick child and you didn't have health insurance, it is a life experience you will never forget. I know. I lived through it. At that time, I thought, if I don't do anything else the rest of my life, I am always going to have health insurance, and I did. At some sacrifice to my wife and me, but we made sure we had it because for a period of time when we had no health insurance, I felt like I had let my family down and I let my daughter down. I didn't want it to happen again.

I didn't want anybody else to go through that. We want to make sure health insurance is there for all of us. Some people say: If you are rich, you ought to get it, but if you are not, tough luck.

I don't think so. I think health care and health insurance protection should be a basic right in this great Nation of America. That was the driving force behind passing ObamaCare, passing the Affordable Care Act.

The Republicans hate the Affordable Care Act like the devil hates holy water. They despise it. Over 60 times they voted to repeal it in the House of Representatives. It drives them into a rage. The first thing they say is, we can't wait to get a new President and abolish ObamaCare.

The obvious responsible question to them is, And what happens the day after you abolish it? What happens when it comes to preexisting conditions? Can health insurance companies now discriminate against people again? What happens when it comes to the limits on how much a health insurance policy would pay? Are we going to be back in the day when there isn't enough coverage when you and your family desperately need it?

What happens to those kids fresh out of college if they can't get on your family health insurance plan? Do you want to go out and buy an individual policy for that son or daughter who is still looking for a job? How about the seniors? Are they going to go back to the time where they have to pay out of pocket for their prescription drugs? I think those are all legitimate questions.

Do you know what the answer is on the Republican side? Trust us. We are just going to abolish this program, and someday, not today and not soon, but someday we will come up with another

idea. That is irresponsible. They are replacing affordable care with chaos. They are saying to the American people: Just trust us. Someday we will dream up a plan.

You know what, they have had 6 years to come up with a plan, 6 years to come up with an alternative to the Affordable Care Act. They have been unable to do it. It is difficult. It is painful.

You know what is ironic, the Affordable Care Act is based on a Republican model of health insurance. This was what the Republicans suggested years ago: Use private insurance companies and make it available to all Americans. That is what we did. A lot of Democrats felt there was a better way: Why don't we make a Medicare Program for every American a nonprofit program that is there. We couldn't get it done. We didn't have the votes, and the Republicans wouldn't help us.

In the first step of the new year and the new Congress, the new Republican majority in the Senate wants to abolish the Affordable Care Act, wants to put millions of American families at the mercy of health insurance companies. They must think we are suffering from amnesia and that we had forgotten what that was all about—sitting on the phone for hour after weary hour with some adjuster who may or may not be in the United States, trying to argue about whether your son or daughter can go into a hospital, whether your wife can receive the medical treatment the doctor asked about.

That is what it used to be, and that is what it is going to go back to when we abolish the Affordable Care Act and don't replace it with something that is as good or better. That is the first step in the Republican program, make 20 to 30 million Americans more vulnerable when it comes to their health care. That is not the end of it.

I live in a State that has the great city of Chicago, Cook County regional area, but downstate we are very rural, smalltown America. I know from my congressional experience and from my life as a Senator representing that State, there are downstate hospitals that cannot survive without the Affordable Care Act. In my State, some of those hospitals are the major employers in their communities and the only go-to place for someone seriously ill or injured.

The Republicans have yet to suggest any suggestion at all about how we are going to keep those hospitals open. They are starting to contact me now—the hospitals as well as the clinics and the health care providers, and they are asking: The Republicans really aren't going to do this, are they? They are not just going to abolish it and leave us with this chaos to follow.

Sad to say, that is exactly what they are going to do. Senator RAND PAUL of Kentucky wrote an article today and said he thought it was wrong on the Republican side to do that. He said: The responsible thing to do is to have

an alternative before you abolish the Affordable Care Act. Good for him. That is common sense. You would expect it from a party that says it is conservative in its approach to government. What they are suggesting with the Affordable Care Act is not conservative. It is destructive. It is catastrophic. It is irresponsible.

I hope my colleagues will join me. We need two or three Republicans to join us to stop this effort. Let us sit down together, Democrats and Republicans, take the Affordable Care Act and make it more effective, fix the problems that are part of it—and there are some—make sure we keep our promise to the American people that they will have access to affordable, quality health care. Keep these providers covered by the Affordable Care Act in business in rural areas and inner cities and all across our Nation. That is our responsibility.

#### DACA

Mr. President, 16 days from now, and just a few steps from where the Senate Chamber is located, we will have an inauguration for the 45th President of the United States, Donald Trump. On that day, the fate of more than 750,000 young people in America will be hanging in the balance. They will be waiting to learn whether they have a place in our Nation's future or whether they will be asked to leave.

It was 7 years ago that I sent a letter to President Obama, joined by Senator Richard Lugar, Republican of Indiana. On a bipartisan basis, we asked the President to stop the deportation of young immigrants who grew up in this country. We called them DREAMers, after a bill I introduced 15 years ago. Who are they? Babies, infants, toddlers, children, young adults under the age of 16 brought to America by their parents from another country, and the proper papers were not filed. You can't hold the kids responsible. They didn't decide to come here. You certainly can't hold them responsible for not filing the papers. They were just children at the time.

If anybody should be held responsible, it is the parents. What do we do about the kids who have lived their entire lives in the United States believing this was their country, this was their future, and now come to realize in their teenage years they are undocumented and their future is uncertain?

We asked President Obama: Will you give these young people a temporary opportunity to stay, study, and work in America, and he agreed to do it. It was called DACA. It was the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program. What it said was, if you are in that category of a child brought to America and you are undocumented, step forward, pay a filing fee of almost \$500 so the government can process your application, submit yourself to a criminal background check, including fingerprints, and let us look into your background and see if there is anything you have done that would disqualify you

from staying in the United States. If you are approved, for 2 years—renewable—you will not be deported and you can work in America.

Many young people in that circumstance were reluctant to step forward. Their parents had warned them their entire lives that if they turned themselves into the government, they might be deported—in fact, their family might be deported with them. They said: The President has offered us this opportunity for a chance. We are going to follow this, do the right thing, make an application. Almost 800,000 of them qualified. They are DACA recipients. Others will be eligible in the months ahead. DACA has been a success.

What will President Donald Trump do with these DACA students? He made some pretty harsh statements during the course of the campaign about immigration. I think he is reflecting on these kids as a special category. This is what President-Elect Donald Trump said to *TIME* magazine just a few weeks ago about the DREAMers, the DACA recipients.

We're going to work something out that's going to make people happy and proud. They got brought here at a very young age, they've worked here, they've gone to school here. Some were good students. Some have wonderful jobs. And they're in never-never land because they don't know what's going to happen.

I appreciate Mr. Trump's comments, soon-to-be President Trump. I hope he will keep the DACA Program in place, but I am working with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to give him an option. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, Republican of South Carolina, and I have joined the lead sponsors on what we call the BRIDGE Act. The BRIDGE Act is an opportunity to protect these young people legally, on a temporary basis, while Congress rolls up its sleeves and takes up immigration.

I am happy to have Senator LISA MURKOWSKI and JEFF FLAKE, Republicans from Alaska and Arizona as co-sponsors, as well as DIANNE FEINSTEIN of California and CHUCK SCHUMER of New York, and I hope others will follow. I believe DACA was a lawful exercise of the President's authority. Some disagree with that completely. Regardless of whether you agree or disagree, I hope you will agree that these young people should be allowed to have a bridge so they aren't deported, they don't lose their right to work or go to school.

Incidentally, when these young DACA DREAMers go to school, they have to pay for it right out of their pockets. They don't qualify for any Federal assistance. It is a special effort and a special sacrifice. I have come to the floor over 100 times over the last 10 or so years to tell the stories of these young people. I think the stories tell a lot more than any speech I could give.

This young man is Luis Gonzalez. Forgive me for being especially drawn to this photo because Luis is standing in front of my college, Georgetown



University, wearing one of the Georgetown Hoyas shirts.

Let me tell you about Luis. He was 8 years old when his family came to the United States from Mexico. He had a difficult childhood in Santa Ana, California. His parents separated. He lived with his mom in a car garage for several years. After his mom remarried, he lived with his stepfather, who turned out to be abusive.

Luis overcame these circumstances and still was a good student. He graduated high school in the top 1 percent of his class with a 4.69 GPA, and he passed all nine advanced placement exams that he took. He was involved in extracurricular and volunteer activities. He was the secretary of the school's National Honor Society, and he helped organize an anti-bullying campaign in his local elementary school. He was a mentor to incoming freshmen in high school. Saturdays, instead of taking it easy, he volunteered to tutor other kids in math, and he volunteered to help a teacher at a local school. He was active in his church every Sunday, translated the pastor's sermon into English for those who didn't speak Spanish, and cleaned up the church before and after the Sunday services.

Because of his outstanding record in high school, Luis was admitted to Georgetown University. He is currently a sophomore majoring in American studies and minoring in government. He continues to use his spare time to help others. He is a member of the provost committee for diversity and co-chair of Hoya Saxa Weekend, a program that brings students from under-represented communities to Georgetown. Luis is a leader of Strive for College, a program that mentors students in the inner city high schools. His dream is to be a high school teacher, which isn't surprising given the strong commitment he has already shown.

He wrote me a letter and here's what he said:

DACA gave me the confidence and security I've not had before. I lived in fear and the shadows. Thanks to DACA, however, I've been able to do things I otherwise wouldn't be able to do like travel through an airport or working on campus. I've always felt that I am an American, but having DACA allowed me to stop living in constant fear and uncertainty. Now these fears have come back again.

If DACA is eliminated, Luis could be forced back into the shadows. The day after DACA, Luis will not be able to travel or work on a campus. He will lose his legal status, and he could be deported back to Mexico, a country that he hasn't lived in since he was 8 years old.

Luis and other DREAMers have a lot to give America. Would we be stronger if we deport him, take this man's talent, drive, and energy and banish him from this country? I don't think so.

I hope President-Elect Trump will understand this and will continue the DACA program. If he decides to end DACA, then I hope this administration

will work with Congress to pass the BRIDGE Act into law for Luis and for thousands of others who will be counting on it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 28 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FLAKE. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in the quorum call be equally divided between both sides.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I want to comment and say a few words about the use of the budget reconciliation process to facilitate an effort to repeal but not replace ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. I serve on the Budget Committee. During the course of multiple hearings during the previous year before the election, we heard the most adamant stories from the Republican side about how dire our Nation's debt situation was, how dire our Nation's deficit was.

Member after Member on the Republican side spoke as if the end of the Republic was at hand. Yet the policies from the Bush administration that kept driving that debt and that deficit they protect. They blamed President Obama for the effect of Bush policies that took place during President Obama's years, while defending those Bush policies the President had actually tried to correct. In many respects, their concern about the budget was a little ironic since they were defending the Bush policies that created this debt and deficit explosion in the first place.

Nevertheless, be that as it may, you had this phalanx of Republican Senators in a state of very high animation about our debt and deficit. You would think that in this Congress, with control both over the House and the Senate and a Republican President-elect looming, they might use the budget reconciliation process to do something about the debt and the deficit.

After all, there was a lot of big talk last year, and here is the budget reconciliation process. As we see, it is not being used to do anything about the debt or the deficit, it is being used to open an effort to repeal but not replace ObamaCare. The problem is, when you do that, you do some pretty bad things to the debt and to the deficit.

Before the Affordable Care Act was passed, Medicare officials projected out-year costs for Medicare in 10-year

increments. After the experience of the Affordable Care Act, they went back and they redid those projections, and they dropped the cost of Medicare dramatically. Those outyear costs, dramatically reduced, are an important, valuable step toward lower debt, balanced budgets, and less of a national annual deficit. Repealing ObamaCare will undo that.

It was pretty clear from Budget Committee hearings that that reduction in anticipated Medicare costs in the out-years was related to the work that had been done in the Affordable Care Act as well as the changes in experience that we are seeing. That is one budget buster which shows that this reconciliation effort is going in the wrong direction.

In Rhode Island, I watched this issue pretty closely because I want Rhode Island to be a leader in delivery system reform. I want ours to be one of the most efficient health care systems in the country, and I worked very hard over many years to put the pieces in place in Rhode Island to help make that come to pass. So I talked to people like Dr. Kurose, who runs one of our largest primary care practices, and Dr. Puerini, who runs another very big Rhode Island primary care practice, and I saw that both of them had taken advantage of the Affordable Care Act to make themselves accountable care organizations, ACOs, and they have used the powers and they have used the shared savings under those programs to change the way they deliver medicine.

What they show is that their price, their annual cost of service per patient, is actually going down. They are delivering care more efficiently and they are getting to illnesses earlier. They are not just churning the wheel of bill and pay, bill and pay, bill and pay; they are actually managing their patients' health. We hit this wonderful sweet spot where the patients are healthier and the patients are way happier because they are getting better service, and the cost per patient in these practices is coming down. So if that is taken away, we reverse that effect. It is plausible to think that those costs will start going back up again. Why would we want to undo a method that has helped local practices improve the quality of care, reduce the cost of care, and serve their patients better? The ACO program is part of the Affordable Care Act.

The last thing is that around here, we try to defend Medicare. One of the achievements of the Affordable Care Act was that it extended the solvency of Medicare out to 2028. Undo this bill and there will be a direct hit on Medicare's solvency. It will come roaring back.

So when you put what the Republican Senators on the Budget Committee said with such vehemence and alarm about the debt and the deficit beside the use to which they have put the reconciliation process, which was designed to be used to reduce the debt and the deficit, and you look at how

that actually plays out through the health care system—increasing the costs of what would have been accountable care organizations, if that gets undone; lifting back up, presumably, Medicare costs that in the outyears were reduced because of this; and shrinking the time that Medicare stands as solvent—if that is not a hit on Medicare, I don't know what is.

The other piece in this process that bears on this is that during the period that these very dramatic concerns were being expressed about the debt and the deficit, the same party that was enunciating those concerns and those threats to our American society and solvency was defending all of the loopholes in the Tax Code. We tried and tried to find a loophole that our Republican friends would be willing to let go of, and we couldn't find a single one that I recall. Even President Trump is interested in trying to get rid of the carried interest loophole that lets hedge fund billionaires pay lower tax rates than brick masons, but could we get an agreement on that from our colleagues on the other side? No. They wouldn't touch it.

I hope that as we go forward, we can find a way to bring tax expenditures lined up with appropriated expenditures under the purview of the committee, but so far we have been unable to do that despite repeated bipartisan testimony that a tax expenditure is just the same as an appropriated expenditure in so far as it affects the debt and deficit—no difference—bipartisan testimony, clear on the record. The difference is that behind a great many of these lucrative tax loopholes that are baked into the Tax Code and that survive year after year after year is a special interest, whether it is somebody trying to depreciate their private jet more rapidly than an airline can depreciate passenger aircraft, whether it is the carried interest loophole that puts, very likely, the billionaire getting out of his limousine in front of his New York apartment in a lower tax rate than the guy holding the umbrella over his head, the doorman. How fair is that? But that is the status of the tax law. We couldn't get anybody to budge on that because there are obviously big, powerful interests who don't want to see that messed with. Why should they pay taxes like ordinary people when they are superwealthy immortals who can buy themselves politicians?

So the ironies of the party that declaimed about debt and deficit with such vehemence through so many hearings, with so much blame on President Obama even though it was carried-forward Bush policies they were defending that were driving so much of that debt—to have that group of people now come and use the reconciliation process designed and intended to address the debt and the deficit instead to try to repeal but not replace ObamaCare in ways that I think can be very fairly projected to raise Medicare costs, reduce Medicare solvency, and undo a

good deal of the savings that doctors and taxpayers have shared from hard-working practices like Rhode Island Primary Care Physicians and Coastal Medical in Rhode Island, which have relied on the ACO provisions in the Affordable Care Act to get those savings—who wants to undo that? It makes no sense, and least of all, it makes no budget sense because those outyear health care costs will come home into the budget in those outyears. Of course, you compound that with the fact that no tax loophole is to be touched. No tax loophole can be addressed. No revenue can be generated by closing the carried interest loophole, closing the private jet deduction, closing the tax benefits for the fossil fuel industry, which is making more money than any industry has in history and hardly needs the support of the poor American taxpayer. But, no, big special interests have big tax breaks, and they are going to be protected at all costs. That is really where we are on this.

I understand we used reconciliation to move ObamaCare. It did, in fact, do the job of reducing the deficit, I believe. Undoing it goes in the opposite direction, but there is a certain “what is good for the goose is good for the gander” equivalence about using that to undo what we did. I get that. But if we are really serious about addressing the debt and deficit, then we shouldn't be using the reconciliation process, which is designed to reduce them both, to attack a health care program whose effect has been to reduce them both. That is where we stand right now.

In the months ahead, I hope we will be able to look at tax expenditures. More money goes out the back door through tax expenditures than gets spent on some of our biggest programs. It is a huge loophole, and within it are a lot of very unattractive special interest special provisions—loopholes in the worst sense of the word. We don't want to touch them because nobody dares to touch the special interests behind them.

So that is where we are. I hope we can make real progress on the debt and the deficit and stop defending private jet reductions, stop defending fossil fuel subsidies, stop defending billionaire special tax breaks, and actually put the debt and the deficit that America faces first rather than having conversations about that being window dressing until you get a Republican President, and then you go completely haywire, using the reconciliation process to undo health care laws, raise Medicare costs, and undo the ACO program that has been so effective in my State.

I see the junior Senator from Utah is presiding, and I know that Utah and Intermountain have some of the best health care work being done on delivery system reform, and it would surprise me very much if the leaders at Intermountain in Utah were excited about undoing the delivery system re-

form provisions of Obamacare. The Innovation Center at the Centers for Medicare Services, the ACO provisions, the provisions for shared savings between doctors and the taxpayer when savings accrue because of better practices, the changes toward better models of payment—I would be very surprised if they were very enthusiastic about undoing those.

But, as I said, this is where we are, and I will close my remarks, and I hope that soon, once this exercise is over, we can actually get serious about closing loopholes and reducing the debt and reducing the deficit—the nominal cause of the Republicans on the Budget Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be evenly divided between the two sides during the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. With that understanding, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time divided equally between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MINEWORKER PENSIONS AND HEALTH CARE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, 70 years ago United Mine Workers president John L. Lewis, a lifelong Republican, sat down with the Democratic Secretary of the Interior, Julius Krug. They struck a deal to end a national strike. They promised health and pension benefits for miners in exchange for a lifetime of hard work. It is a promise that the Federal Government has kept ever since.

For 70 years, no matter the President, no matter the party in control of the Senate, we have kept that promise. That changed, unfortunately, in December. This body left for vacation. It left tens of thousands of mine workers to face an uncertain future, not knowing if the pensions and health care they had earned for themselves—and in many cases for their widows—over a lifetime of hard work would be there for them in the future. This is shameful.

Senator PORTMAN, my Republican colleague from Ohio, and I and Senator MANCHIN and Senator CAPITO, a Democrat and a Republican from West Virginia, and Senator CASEY—a number of us—said: We should not leave Washington to go home to our families until we take care of mine worker families.

Congress has the power to stop these cuts and to live up to this pledge. We had a bipartisan solution that would have passed if it had been brought to the floor. But instead, Congress broke its promise to these miners and their families. Congress stole the health care they had earned by passing a continuing resolution that failed to address the pension problem, and it stole the funds that were still left in their health care plan to pay for a 4-month fix—4 months, 4 months. Who can make health care decisions when you don't know if you will have health care coverage 4 months from now?

These working people don't deserve to live with this kind of uncertainty. I have heard my colleagues, particularly on the Republican side of the aisle, always talk about predictability. Government should never inject more uncertainty into the lives of individuals, never should inject uncertainty into the lives of business people as they make investment decisions.

But that is what we have done with these mine workers. We have made their lives less certain, less predictable, and their health care so unpredictable. This is the health care these workers fought for, the health care they sacrificed raises for. Keep in mind that at the bargaining table, workers will be willing to accept less wages today in exchange for health care and pensions in the future. That is what collective bargaining is often about. That is what is so important.

This is health care they sacrificed raises for. It was the health care we promised them. My colleagues know their stories of hard work and sacrifice. We know these stories because over the past year, these miners traveled here by the busload. They rode long distances. They gathered in the heat and in the cold for hours outside this building to make their voices heard.

They worked decades in the mines—hard back-breaking work. But that work had dignity. It was dangerous work—work where some of them were killed on the job, work where many of them developed health problems later. Many of them died younger than people who dress like we do and have jobs like this. Their widows have been denied these pensions and health care. They clocked in every day, these workers. They knew the conditions they faced. Many of them now suffer from black lung or other illnesses. They accepted a lifetime of hard labor because they valued their jobs, they valued their work, and they believed that good-paying union jobs were their tickets to the middle class.

These miners believed in the covenant we used to have in this country

that promised if you work hard your whole life, if you put in the hours, if you save a little and do your part, you will be able to help your children go to college. They believed that would give their kids a chance at a better life perhaps than they had. They believed that if they upheld their end of the deal, if they put in the work to power our country by mining coal used for a generation of electricity, their government would do the same. In December, Congress told them they were wrong. I don't accept that. These workers sacrificed their lungs and their backs to keep our lights on. It is shameful that Congress, despite all intents and purposes, has stolen what they earned. These miners should have spent Christmas with their grandkids, not worrying about whether they could afford their medicine.

We aren't giving up. We had a bipartisan solution in December. We will keep fighting until mine workers across Ohio and this country have the full health care and retirement security that we promised them. They kept faith with us and powered our country. It is time to keep faith with the workers in our industrial heartland and to right this wrong.

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. 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. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the ensuing quorum call be divided equally between the two sides.

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

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### TRIBUTE TO LARRY CLARK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the first time in three decades, the Kentucky General Assembly began their regular session this month without the fiery voice and passionate character of State Representative Larry

Clark. After an impressive career, Representative Clark started a new adventure: retirement. He will be remembered for many accomplishments in Frankfort, among them that he never missed a single floor vote.

Despite our differences, Representative Clark and I both care deeply for Kentucky. As speaker pro tempore of the house, he championed the merger of the Louisville and Jefferson County governments, an issue I fought for when I was the county judge/executive. We also share a passion for the University of Louisville, and Representative Clark has a record of achievements on behalf of the school.

I join the Kentucky General Assembly in congratulating Representative Clark on his career of public service. He dedicated many years to Kentucky, and I wish him well in retirement.

#### TRIBUTE TO ROBERT L. HENDRICKSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate a distinguished Kentuckian and a friend. Robert L. Hendrickson has been the Publisher of the *Ledger Independent* in Maysville, KY, since 1993. When Bob announced that he would retire at the end of last year, I knew that the paper was not only losing a great journalist, but it also was losing a great man.

Bob graduated from the University of Georgia's Henry Grady School of Journalism. Afterward, he moved back to Kentucky to work on his dad's dairy farm. However, a pair of harsh winters in 1977 and 1978 convinced him, in his own words, "to put my journalism degree to work." He got hired by the *Ledger Independent* and has served his community ever since.

The *Ledger Independent* newspaper serves seven counties in northern Kentucky and southern Ohio. Through a series of owners and publishers, the paper continues a 150-year tradition of a local, independent, daily newspaper in Maysville.

Bob became editor of the paper in 1985, calling it "the best job in the world." In 1993, he was promoted to publisher. He oversaw the entire operation and guided the paper into the internet age with the unveiling of *Maysville Online*. While working full time at the paper, Bob also did post-graduate work at Northwestern University.

Bob and Missy Mann have never stopped working for their neighbors. Bob further dedicates himself to his community, both through his service on the board of directors of the Maysville Chamber of Commerce, and as the moderator of several important political debates in his area.

Bob is a great man and a pillar of his community, and I am honored to call him a friend. I wish him and Missy well in retirement, and I join with countless Kentuckians on thanking him for his service to Maysville.

## TRIBUTE TO LAMAR JACKSON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to offer my congratulations to an outstanding young man and athlete, the University of Louisville Cardinals' quarterback, Lamar Jackson. On December 10 of last year, Cards fans watched with excitement as Jackson was awarded the Heisman Memorial Trophy, the first in the history of my alma mater. The award is given to the most outstanding player in college football, and Jackson surely has earned it.

We have known for quite some time that Lamar Jackson would be breaking many records. Here are just a few. Jackson was the first player in NCAA Division I history to pass for 3,300 yards and run for 1,500 yards in one season. He holds the Atlantic Coastal Conference, ACC, record for most touchdowns in a single season with 51. Only a sophomore, Jackson is the youngest player ever to win the Heisman Trophy at 19 years old, and he is the University of Louisville's first ever Heisman Trophy finalist. The impressive list goes on and on.

It is clear that Lamar Jackson is a truly spectacular athlete. He has earned his spot in the pantheon of college football greats. It is easy to cheer when the quarterback hurdles a defender to score or runs between some of the best defenses in the Nation. His drive and dedication are traits we all admire, and just wait until you hear where it all started.

In an interview, Jackson said "[e]verything I do, I do for my mother." At an early age, Jackson's mother, Felicia Jones, sparked his interest in football, and she pushed him to be his best ever since. When Lamar and his younger brother were just learning the game, their mom would put on pads in the backyard and run plays with them. She became an active part of all of his teams, all the way to the University of Louisville. He said, "She would tell me the bad things I did. She wouldn't really tell me the good things I did. And I'd say 'All right, Mom. I've got to go fix it.'"

Lamar Jackson's story is just beginning. Under the guidance of some of the best coaches in all of college sports and an athletic director with a strategic vision for the future, the Cardinals are positioned to make a real impact in college football. With the Heisman Trophy already on the shelf, we can only wait and see what Lamar Jackson does next year. As an avid fan of UofL football, I know I can hardly wait.

I would like to join with Cards fans across the Nation to congratulate the entire University of Louisville Cardinals football team and staff on an exciting season and especially congratulate the 2016 Heisman Trophy winner, Lamar Jackson. He has truly made it great to be a Louisville Cardinal.

## TRIBUTE TO JOE TOLAN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, at the beginning of this year, one of Louisville's foremost community servants began his much-deserved retirement. I rise today to congratulate Joseph Tolan, a man of distinction who dedicated his life to the people of Louisville and Kentucky.

Many years ago, I had the pleasure of working alongside Joe. When I served as the judge/executive of Jefferson County, Joe led the county department for human services. I particularly remember his passion for helping those around him, and that passion has been the driving force of his career. And believe me, I can tell you, from firsthand experience, that passion is contagious.

For the last 30 years, Joe has committed himself to the Metro United Way, a Louisville organization that raises and distributes funds to worthy causes around the region. Spending the last 15 years as president and CEO, Joe led the effort to raise nearly \$30 million every year to support approximately 100 organizations. The community support that Joe inspired has led Metro United Way to be ranked in the top 25 markets nationwide.

However, organizations like Metro United Way are measured by so much more than just the donations they raise. True success is counted by the lives impacted and the good work done. With a focus on education, financial stability, and healthy living, Metro United Way impacts thousands of families across the region every single day.

Since joining Metro United Way, Joe has been a major player in the transformation of the city of Louisville and the entire region. Although the organization is over 100 years old, it is constantly adapting to meet today's challenges in the most effective ways possible. With this commitment to excellence and a growing network of strategic partnerships, Metro United Way proved to be a lasting force for good in the community. During his tenure as president and CEO, Joe hasn't just been a part of this innovation, he has been its leader.

Joe has surely earned his retirement, but I know many of us are very sorry to see him go. He leaves behind an impressive list of accomplishments and an organization well positioned to continue his work. I want to extend my congratulations to Joe on such a successful career of dedicated leadership always with a vision to help everyone reach their fullest potential.

## CHANGING SENATE RULES

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today I wish to continue what has become a tradition. At the beginning of the 112th Congress, I took to the Senate floor and called for this body to adopt its rules with a simple majority vote and to amend them so they actually allowed the body to function as our Founders intended.

I did the same at the beginning of the 112th, 113th, and 114th Congresses. Today, at the start of the 115th Congress, I again call for reform. This is something I have done as a member of the majority and the minority. Senator MERKLEY has worked closely with me on this issue and spoke briefly yesterday about our efforts.

But we did not start this tradition. It dates back decades. My predecessor, Clinton Anderson, was a leading proponent of what has become known as the "constitutional option" in the 1950s and 1960s. Vice President Walter Mondale—then a Senator from Minnesota—carried on the tradition in the 1970s. When Senator MERKLEY and I first joined the Senate, Senator Tom Harkin worked closely with us to help us carry on the tradition.

The proposals we have offered to change the rules at the start of a new Congress have never been radical. They were changes we were willing to live with whether we were in the majority or minority. We have offered the same proposals as Members of the majority and minority. We believe the Senate is broken, and even the minority party should want to fix it.

Congress had made some progress in recent years, but unfortunately, it took unprecedented Republican obstruction to bring it about. Republicans blocked nominees to all sorts of positions submitted by President Obama, so we took action to change the rules to break through the gridlock. It was unfortunate that Republicans precipitated that situation, but the result was for the best.

New rules allow for a lower cloture threshold for all nominees except those to the Supreme Court now, and the new Republican President can take advantage of them, just as President Obama was able to do for the final years of his term.

But no one would argue that Congress or the nomination process has been fixed. Further debate and reform is needed on many aspects of Senate function.

We believe the Senate should openly debate and consider its rules at the start of each Congress, to consider changes that can provide commonsense reforms. This ongoing process is the ideal way to restore the best traditions of the Senate and allow it to conduct the business that the American people expect.

We have one goal whether we are in the majority or in the minority: to give the American people the government they expect and deserve—a government that works.

This is not just about rules. It is about the norms and traditions of the Senate.

Neither side is 100 percent pure. Both sides have used the rules for obstruction. No doubt they had their reasons.

But I don't think the American people care about that. They don't want a

history lesson or a lesson in parliamentary procedure. They want a government that is fair, that is reasonable, and that works.

I hope that all my colleagues—and especially the new Senators—give serious consideration to reform.

We do not need to win every legislative or nomination vote. But we need to have a real debate and an open process to ensure we are actually the greatest deliberative body in the world.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### REMEMBERING JOHN “DEPENDS ON HIM” SMITH

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor and remember my good friend John Smith.

On Saturday, December 31, 2016, we lost one of Wyoming’s best leaders and diplomats on the Wind River Reservation. John Smith was a member of the Northern Arapaho tribe. For 27 years, he served as the director of the department of transportation for the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation. Mr. Smith played a major role passing transportation legislation that will save and improve lives on the Wind River Reservation and across tribal communities.

John was a wonderful friend and a wonderful man. I admired him greatly for his big heart, his warmth, and his larger than life personality. John cared deeply about the lives of people who lived and traveled through the Wind River Reservation. John’s commitment to improving his community’s roads can be seen today all over the Wind River Reservation. He was a hard worker, innovative and creative. He was always doing more with less. His jokes and sense of humor always made that hard work a little easier. Indian country did not have a better advocate or finer person to represent them in Washington, DC.

Since John’s work ethic and personality were so big, he naturally lived up to his nickname “Big John” in every respect. As a former football and basketball player, you could see Big John coming from blocks away.

In 2014, John was in Washington, DC, to receive the White House Champions of Change award from the Secretary of Transportation, Anthony Foxx. Big John was being recognized for bringing tribal, State, and local leaders together to complete construction of the notorious 17 Mile Road. When he received the award, Big John took off his cowboy hat and placed it on the head of Secretary Foxx. The unforgettable smile on Big John lit up the room with laughter. This special man left a lasting impression on all those who had the privilege of working with him.

Last April, John testified before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. He talked about dangerous roads that were costing lives in tribal commu-

nities. His testimony led to important legislation being passed to improve those roads. His efforts not only changed lives, it saved them, and we are all grateful. It has been an honor and privilege to work with Big John on highway bills. It has been a higher honor to be his friend.

John leaves big boots to fill, and I am confident the Wind River community will fill those boots and continue his hard work.

As we lift up our hearts and celebrate Big John’s life, we also thank him for his selfless service on behalf of the people of Wyoming. Big John, thank you, and we will miss you.●

##### TRIBUTE TO SHELBY GARDNER

• Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would like to recognize Shelby Gardner, of Warren, AK, as this week’s Arkansan of the Week, for her work with the Arkansas Veterans Hospital posttraumatic stress disorder program in Little Rock.

Shelby is a senior at Warren High School in Bradley County and is proof that you are never too young to give back to your community. Shelby wanted to find a way to honor the men and women who put their lives on the line for our safety: our veterans. Specifically, she wanted to help those veterans who suffer from posttraumatic stress.

After learning about the Arkansas Veterans Hospital posttraumatic stress disorder program, Shelby began to talk with anyone who would listen about the program—friends and family, her church congregation, civic clubs, and other organizations across Warren and Bradley County. She told them about her passion for helping veterans, the good work this program does, and how much it would benefit from additional support.

Her hard work paid off. With the help of a local auctioneer, Shelby organized a community bake sale auction and managed to raise \$8,000 for the Arkansas Veterans Hospital. But Shelby wasn’t finished. She and a group of other volunteers spent hours preparing and selling sandwiches at the Bradley County fair and raised an additional \$2,000, for a grand total of \$10,000 for veterans suffering from posttraumatic stress.

A veteran in Shelby’s community was struck by her commitment to such a noble cause and in his nomination of Shelby wrote: “Her actions are proof that patriotism runs deep in small town America. She is an exceptional representative of many young people in our nation deeply committed to the men and women who serve protecting and defending our nation and our way of life. Shelby is a shining example of the caliber of young person this country requires to ensure the survival of our nation and our values. She is a focused, goal oriented young woman who is a credit to her family, her church, her community, her state and nation.”

I am equally as inspired by Shelby’s hard work and her commitment to our veterans. Patriotism does indeed run deep in a State like Arkansas. Now, because of her efforts, the Veterans Hospital in Little Rock can better serve Arkansans who suffer from PTSD.

It is an honor to recognize Shelby Gardner as Arkansan of the Week, and I am thankful for people like Shelby who, using the resources around them, work to make others’ lives better.●

##### TRIBUTE TO ARLENE MATHEWS

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Arlene Mathews of Helena, MT, for her 63 years of volunteer service at St. Peter’s Hospital.

In a basement in 1953, Arlene began the “Sock Sew,” which makes socks for newborn babies who are born in December at St. Peter’s Hospital to take home.

This year, Arlene and volunteers sitting at 20 sewing machines cut, sewed, and glued 100 large stockings for the newborns and another 100 smaller stockings for patients at St. Peter’s whose Christmas Eve is spent in the hospital. This is a wonderful gesture that made their Christmas in the hospital just a little bit better. Thank you, Arlene, for thinking of those in the hospital, especially during the Christmas season.

I am thrilled to honor our unsung hero, Arlene Mathews, for her 63-year service to her community.●

##### 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.)

##### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 27. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment received by an employee of the Department in the permanent record of the employee.

H.R. 28. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adopt and implement a standard identification protocol for use in the tracking and procurement of biological

implants by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution extending the life of the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to provide for the counting on January 6, 2017, of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution regarding consent to assemble outside the seat of government.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to H. Res. 1, resolving that Karen L. Haas of the State of Maryland, be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives; that Paul D. Irving of the State of Florida be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives; that Philip George Kiko of the State of Ohio be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; and that Father Patrick J. Conroy of the State of Oregon be, and is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to H. Res. 2, resolving that the Senate be informed that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that PAUL D. RYAN, a Representative of the State of Wisconsin, has been elected Speaker; and that Karen L. Haas, a citizen of the State of Maryland, has been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to House Resolution 3, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make: Mr. MCCARTHY of California and Ms. PELOSI of California.

The message further announced that pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of today, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Joint Economic Committee: Mr. TIBERI of Ohio.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 27. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment received by an employee of the Department in the permanent record of the employee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 28. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adopt and implement a standard identification protocol for use in the tracking and procurement of biological implants by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions" (FRL No. 9954-47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators" (FRL No. 9956-70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to Reporting and Notification Requirements and Other Clarifying Changes for Imported Fruits, Vegetables, and Specialty Crops" (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0083) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Aggregation of Positions" (RIN3038-AD82) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Photo Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Card Implementation Requirements" (RIN0584-AE45) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enhancing Retailer Standards in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)" (RIN0584-AE27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Flumioxazin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9955-45) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Forest System Land Management Planning" (RIN0596-AD28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-9. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: New Qualifying Country—Estonia" ((RIN0750-AJ18) (DFARS Case 2017-D001)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-10. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contract Financing" ((RIN0750-AI90) (DFARS Case 2015-D026)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-11. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children" (RIN0790-AJ33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-12. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-13. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Iran-Related Multilateral Sanctions Regime Efforts" covering the period February 7, 2016 to August 6, 2016; to the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Finance; and Foreign Relations.

EC-14. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0084) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-15. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Almonds Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0045) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-16. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of



Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Increased Assessment Rate” (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0077) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-17. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Walnuts Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate” (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0062) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-18. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Promotion” (RIN0584-AE44) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-19. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal years 2004 and 2005 Operations and Maintenance, Army, and was assigned case number 15-03; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-20. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report entitled, “Acceptance of Contributions for Defense Programs, Projects, and Activities; Defense Cooperation Account” and a semiannual listing of personal property contributed by coalition partners; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-21. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2014 annual report on the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-22. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Depository Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks” (RIN3064-AE42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-23. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility; (Chambers and Harris Counties, TX, et al.)” ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2016-0002)) during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-24. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP): Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement” ((RIN1660-AA86) (Docket No. FEMA-2016-0012)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the

President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-25. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Russian Sanctions: Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List, and Clarification of License Review Policy” (RIN0694-AH25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-26. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Narrowing the Digital Divide Through Installation of Broadband Infrastructure in HUD-Funded New Construction and Substantial Rehabilitation of Multifamily Rental Housing” (RIN2501-AD75) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-27. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safe Harbors From Liability Under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act for Certain Actions Taken in Compliance with Mortgage Servicing Rules Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)” (RIN3170-AA49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-28. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendments to the 22013 Mortgage Rules Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures” (RIN3170-AA49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-29. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-30. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Exemption Threshold” (RIN7100-AD90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-31. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Consumer Leasing (Regulation M)” (RIN3170-AA66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-32. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Public Disclosure Requirements; Extension of Compliance Period for

Certain Companies to Meet the Liquidity Coverage Ratio Requirements” (RIN7100-AE39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-33. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Truth in Lending (Regulation Z)” (RIN7100-AA67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-34. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-35. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modernizing HUD’s Consolidated Planning Process to Narrow the Digital Divide and Increase Resilience to Natural Hazards” (RIN2506-AC41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-36. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, with respect to Belarus; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-37. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-38. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility (Walton County, GA, et al.)” ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2016-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-39. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility (McKean County, PA, et al.)” ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2016-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-40. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold” (12 CFR Part 1003) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-41. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the

issuance of an Executive Order that takes additional steps to address the increasing use of significant malicious cyber-enabled activities to undermine democratic processes or institutions with respect to the national emergency originally declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-42. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Acquired Member Assets” (RIN2590-AA80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-43. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Instituting Smoke-Free Public Housing” (RIN2577-AC97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-44. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Home Loan Bank New Business Activities Final Rule” (RIN2590-AA84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-45. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Commerce’s Bureau of Industry and Security Annual Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-46. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Enterprise Duty to Serve Underserved Markets” (RIN2590-AA27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-47. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau on College Credit Cards; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-48. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Depository Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks” (RIN1557-AE01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-49. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Bureau for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-50. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled “Housing Counseling: New Certification Requirements” (RIN2502-A194) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-51. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Record-keeping for Timely Deposit Insurance Determination” (RIN3064-AE33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-52. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List” (RIN0694-AH21) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-53. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to discretionary appropriations legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-54. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties” (RIN1990-AA46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-55. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Walk-in Coolers and Walk-in Freezers” (RIN1904-AD72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-56. A communication from the Departmental Freedom of Information Act Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Freedom of Information Act Regulations” (RIN1093-AA21) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-57. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Resource Management Planning” (RIN1004-AE39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 12, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-58. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Uninterruptible Power Supplies” (RIN1904-AD68) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-59. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of

Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Commercial Packaged Boilers” (RIN1904-AD16) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-60. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Dishwashers” (RIN1904-AD24) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-61. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Special Regulations: Areas of the National Park System, Cape Hatteras National Seashore—Off-Road Vehicle Management” (RIN1024-AE33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-62. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Cooking Products” (RIN1904-AC71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-63. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Reliability Standard for Transmission System Planned Performance for Geomagnetic Disturbance Events” ((RIN1902-AF25 and RIN1902-AF11) (Docket Nos. RM16-15-000 and RM15-25-001)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-64. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Competitive Processes, Terms, and Conditions for Leasing Public Lands for Solar and Wind Energy Development and Technical Changes and Corrections” (RIN1004-AE24) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-65. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Procedural Rules for DOE Nuclear Activities” (RIN1992-AA52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-66. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of the Department of Energy’s Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Regulations” (RIN1901-AB41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-67. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold” (12 CFR Part 1026) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-68. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of General Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Increase in the Maximum Amount of Primary Nuclear Liability Insurance” ((RIN3150-AJ71) (NRC-2016-0164)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-69. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of General Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Withdrawal of Regulatory Guides 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5” (NRC-2016-0246) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-70. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2016 Project Deauthorization list; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-71. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Fiscal Year 2014 Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress”; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-72. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of New Reactors, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Changes to Aging Management Guidance for Various Steam Generator Components” (LR-ISG-2016-01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 12, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-73. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Assessing the Technical Adequacy of the Advanced Light-Water Reactor Probabilistic Risk Assessment for the Design Certification Application and Combined License Application” (DC/COL-ISG-028) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 12, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-74. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR 4) for Public Water Systems and Announcement of Public Meeting” ((RIN2040-AF49) (FRL-9956-71-OW)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-75. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Reclassification of the Sheboygan, Wisconsin Area to Moderate Nonattainment for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards” (FRL-9956-95-Region 5)

received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-76. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Promulgation of Certain Federal Water Quality Standards Applicable to Maine” ((RIN2040-AF59) (FRL-9952-99-OW)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-77. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Determination of Nonattainment and Reclassification of the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria 2008 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Texas” (FRL-9956-08-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-78. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Credit Assistance for Water Infrastructure Projects” ((RIN2040-AF63) (FRL-9953-24-OW)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-79. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District; Stationary Source Permits; Correcting Amendment” (FRL-9956-65-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-80. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; TN; Revisions to the Knox County Portion of the TN SIP” (FRL-9956-63-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-81. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Tennessee; Regional Haze Progress Report” (FRL-9956-90-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-82. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Ohio portion of the Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard” (FRL-9956-60-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-83. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled “Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Columbus, Ohio Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard” (FRL-9956-59-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-84. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Part 9 Miscellaneous Rules” (FRL-9956-62-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-85. A communication from the Eagle Program Manager, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Eagle Permits; Revisions to Regulations for Eagle Incidental Take and Take of Eagle Nests” (RIN1018-AY30) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-86. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fitness for Duty—Operational Program” (NUREG-0800) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-87. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Protection of Visibility: Amendments to Requirements for State Plans” ((RIN2060-AS55) (FRL No. 9957-05-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-88. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Louisiana; Redesignation of Baton Rouge 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment” (FRL No. 9956-92-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-89. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Determination of Attainment of the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Eastern San Luis Obispo, California” (FRL No. 9956-98-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-90. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Volatile Organic Compounds Emissions from Fiberglass Boat Manufacturing Materials” (FRL No. 9957-20-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-91. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval of California State Implementation Plan Revisions; Butte County Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits" (FRL No. 9955-16-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-92. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Mississippi; Interstate Transport (Prongs 1 and 2) for the 2010 1-hour NO<sub>2</sub> Standard" (FRL No. 9957-09-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-93. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; MA; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements" (FRL No. 9952-94-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-94. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of a Subsurface Intrusion Component to the Hazard Ranking System" ((RIN2050-AG67) (FRL No. 9956-58-OLEM)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-95. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Technical Correction" ((RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 9956-13)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-96. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Attainment of the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Mariposa County, California" (FRL No. 9956-66-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-97. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2015 Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions and Performance"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-98. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Toxic Substance Control Act Chemical Substance Import Certification Process Revisions" (RIN1515-AE13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-99. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations

Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importations of Certain Vehicles and Engines Subject to Federal Anti-pollution Emission Standards" (RIN1515-AE11) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-100. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—January 2017" (Rev. Rul. 2017-2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-101. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Ruling: 2016 Base Period T-Bill Rate" (Rev. Rul. 2017-01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-102. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Conditions for Coverage for End-Stage Renal Disease Facilities—Third Party Payment" ((RIN0938-AT11)(CMS-3337-IFC)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-103. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Eligibility for Exemption from User Fee Requirement for Employee Plans Determination Letter Applications Filed on or After January 1, 2017" (Notice 2017-1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-104. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beginning of Construction for Sections 45 and 48" (Notice 2017-04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-105. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2016 Required Amendments List for Qualified Retirement Plans" (Notice 2016-80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-106. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Mileage Rate" (Notice 2016-79) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-107. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Eligibility Rule Waivers for Certain Automatic

Changes Made to comply with the Final Tangible Property Regulations" (Notice 2017-6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-108. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Premium Tax Credit Regulation VI" ((RIN1545-BN50) (TD 9804)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-109. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance Regarding Predecessors and Successors Under Section 355(e); Limitation on Gain Recognition; Guidance Under Section 355(f)" ((RIN1545-BN18)(TD 9805)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-110. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treatment of Certain Transfers of Property to Foreign Corporations" ((RIN1545-BL87)(TD 9803)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-111. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treatment of Certain Domestic Entities Disregarded as Separate from Their Owners as Corporations for Purposes of Section 6038A" ((RIN1545-BM94) (TD 9796)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-112. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Disclosures of Return Information Reflected on Returns to Officers and Employees of the Department of Commerce for Certain Statistical Purposes and Related Activities" ((RIN1545-BN64) (TD 9802)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-113. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Issue Price Definition for Tax-Exempt Bonds" ((RIN1545-BM46) (TD 9801)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-114. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007" (RIN0960-AH95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-115. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ensuring Program Uniformity at



the Hearing and Appeals Council Levels of the Administrative Review Process" (RIN0960-AH71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-116. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Flexibility, Efficiency, and Modernization in Child Support Enforcement Programs" (RIN0970-AC50 and RIN0938-AR92) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-117. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System" (RIN0970-AC47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-118. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Total Loss-Absorbing Capacity Instruments" (Rev. Proc. 2017-12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-119. A communication from the Attorney, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Correction to Applicability Date for Modification of Regulations Regarding Price Adjustments in Antidumping Duty Proceedings" (RIN0625-AB02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-120. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress: Results and Performance of the Hospital Value-Based Purchasing Program"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-121. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Revision of U.S. Munitions List Category XV" (RIN1400-AD33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-122. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2016-0178—2016-0182); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-123. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2016-0169—2016-0177); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-124. A communication from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Presidential Determination No. 2013-06 relative to defense services to France in their efforts to secure Mali

from terrorists and violent extremists and Presidential Determination No. 2014-13 relative to defense services to France for continued support efforts in Mali, Niger, and Chad; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-125. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report of the Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the six months ending December 31, 2015"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-126. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16-102); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-127. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Australia Group; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-128. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report of the Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the six months ending December 31, 2015"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-129. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; HHS Notice of Benefit Payment Parameters for 2018; Amendments to Special Enrollment Periods and the Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan Program" ((RIN0938-AS95 and RIN0938-AS87) (CMS-9934-F)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-130. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Refuse to Accept Procedures for Premarket Tobacco Product Submissions" (Docket No. FDA-2016-N-1555) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-131. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for Handling Retaliation Complaints Under Section 31307 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21)" (RIN1218-AC88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-132. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interpretive Bulletin Relating to the Exercise of Shareholder Rights and Written Statements of Investment Policy, Including Proxy Voting Policies or Guidelines" (RIN1210-AB78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of

the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-133. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-134. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4044) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-135. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Westinghouse Electric Corporation in Bloomfield, New Jersey, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-136. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Bliss and Laughlin Steel site in Buffalo, New York, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-137. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Blockson Chemical Company site in Joliet, Illinois, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-138. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Feed Grade Sodium Formate" (Docket No. FDA-2015-F-4282) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-139. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Postmarketing Safety Reporting for Combination Products" ((RIN0910-AF82) (Docket No. FDA-2008-N-0424)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-140. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Claims Procedure for Plans Providing Disability Benefits" (RIN1210-AB39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-141. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Division of Select Agents

and Toxins, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "World Trade Center Health Program; Amendments to Definitions, Appeals, and Other Requirements" (RIN0920-AA56, RIN0920-AA44, RIN0920-AA48, and RIN0920-AA50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-142. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Requirements for Foreign and Domestic Establishment Registration and Listing for Human Drugs, Including Drugs That Are Regulated Under a Biologics License Application, and Animal Drugs; Correction" ((RIN0910-AA49) (Docket No. FDA-2005-N-0464)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-143. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Title I—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged—Academic Assessments" (RIN1810-AB32) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-144. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Program Integrity and Improvement" (RIN1810-AD20) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-145. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, As Amended By the Every Student Succeeds Act—Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority" (RIN1810-AB31) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-146. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2012 and 2014 Regional Partnership Grants to Increase the Well-Being of and to Improve the Permanency Outcomes for Children Affected by Substance Abuse: Third Annual Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-147. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Program Integrity and Improvement" (RIN1840-AD20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-148. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Health and Human Services Grants Regulation" (RIN0991-AC06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-149. A joint communication from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting,

pursuant to law, a report relative to Thefts, Losses, or Releases of Select Agents and Toxins for Calendar Year 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-150. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Coordination of Federal HIV Programs for Fiscal Years 2014-2015"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-151. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Division of Select Agents and Toxins, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "World Trade Center Health Program; Amendments to Definitions, Appeals, and Other Requirements" (RIN0920-AA56, RIN0920-AA44, RIN0920-AA48, and RIN0920-AA50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-152. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Compliance with Title X Requirements by Project Recipients in Selecting Subrecipients" (RIN0937-AA04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-153. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "State Long-Term Care Ombudsman Programs" (RIN0985-AA08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-154. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to Accreditation of Third-Party Certification Bodies to Conduct Food Safety Audits and to Issue Certifications to Provide for the User Fee Program" ((RIN0910-AH23) (Docket No. FDA-2011-N-0146)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-155. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Run-away and Homeless Youth" (RIN0970-AC43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-156. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Savings Arrangements Established by Qualified State Political Subdivisions for Non-Governmental Employees" (RIN1210-AB76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-157. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training,

Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Apprenticeship Programs: Equal Employment Opportunity" (RIN1205-AB59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-158. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clarification of Employer's Continuing Obligation To Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness" (RIN1218-AC84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-159. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Labeling: Health Claims; Dietary Saturated Fat and Cholesterol and Risk of Coronary Heart Disease" ((RIN0910-AH43) (Docket No. FDA-2013-P-0047)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-160. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "General Hospital and Personal Use Devices: Renaming of Pediatric Hospital Bed Classification and Designation of Special Controls for Pediatric Medical Crib; Classification of Medical Bassinet" (Docket No. FDA-2015-N-0701) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-161. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Banned Devices: Powdered Surgeon's Gloves, Powdered Patient Examination Gloves, and Absorbable Powder for Lubricating a Surgeon's Glove" ((RIN0910-AH02) (Docket No. FDA-2015-N-5017)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-162. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities; Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities" ((RIN1820-AB73) (Docket ID ED-2015-OSERS-0132)) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-163. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2016, including the Office of Inspector General's Auditor's Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-164. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Payment of Subcontractors" ((RIN9000-AM98) (FAC 2005-94)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office



of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-165. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Acquisition Regulation; Privacy Training” (RIN9000-AM06) (FAC 2005-94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-166. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-94; Introduction” (FAC 2005-94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-167. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Financial Report for the Office of Government Ethics for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-168. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Personnel Management in Agencies” (RIN3206-AL98) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-169. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Update Contract Reporting Responsibilities” (RIN3090-AJ80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-170. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016, through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-171. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulatory Implementation of the Centers of Excellence and Expertise” (RIN1650-AB02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-172. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Post-Employment Conflict of Interest Restrictions; Revision of Departmental Component Designations” (RIN3209-AA14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-173. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled “Post-Employment Conflict of Interest Restrictions; Revision of Departmental Component Designations” (RIN3209-AA14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-174. A communication from the Vice President (Acting) for Congressional and Public Affairs, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation’s Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-175. A communication from the Inspector General of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General’s Semiannual Report to Congress for the period from April 1, 2016, through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-176. A communication from the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-177. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-178. A communication from the Acting Director, Employment Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Recruitment, Selection, and Placement (General) And Suitability” (RIN3206-AN25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-179. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, the President’s Pay Agent, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of locality based comparability payments; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-180. A communication from the Acting Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Removal of Eligible Family Members from Existing Self and Family Enrollments” (RIN3206-AN43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-181. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the New York, NY, and Philadelphia, PA, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas” (RIN3206-AN29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-182. A communication from the Acting Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Employees Health Benefits Program: Removal of Ineligible Individuals from Existing Enrollments” (RIN3206-AN09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-183. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Employment in the Excepted Service” (RIN3206-AN30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-184. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of Certain Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas” (RIN3206-AN38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-185. A communication from the Acting Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Employees Health Benefits And Federal Employees Dental And Vision Insurance Programs’ Coverage Exception For Children Of Same-Sex Domestic Partners” (RIN3206-AN34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-186. A communication from the Director, Office of Administration, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions from the Unanticipated Needs Account for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-187. A communication from the Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “The Merit System Principles: Guiding the Fair and Effective Management of the Federal Workforce”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-188. A communication from the Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Department of Homeland Security Privacy Office 2016 Annual Report to Congress”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-189. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s Semiannual Report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-190. A communication from the Director, Congressional, Legislative, and Intergovernmental Affairs, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Agency Financial Report, Fiscal Year 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-191. A communication from the Chairwoman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016 and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-192. A communication from the Executive Director, Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Privacy Act Regulations” (RIN3219-AA00) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-193. A communication from the General Manager, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety

Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal years 2014 and 2015 inventories and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the reports; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-194. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports entitled "2015 Information Collection Budget of the United States Government" and "2016 Information Collection Budget of the United States Government"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-195. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-93; Small Entity Compliance Guide" (FAC 2005-93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-196. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces; Injunction" ((RIN9000-AN30) (FAC 2005-93)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-197. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Paid Sick Leave for Federal Contractors" ((RIN9000-AN27) (FAC 2005-93)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-198. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-93; Introduction" (FAC 2005-93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-199. A communication from the Special Counsel, Office of the Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2016" and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-200. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Education Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-201. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces; Injunction" ((RIN9000-AN30) (FAC 2005-93)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-202. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics,

and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary (Intelligence and Analysis), Department of the Treasury, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-203. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Recognition of Organizations and Accreditation of Non-Attorney Representatives" (RIN1125-AA72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-204. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards and Procedures for the Enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act" (RIN1190-AA71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-205. A communication from the Supervisory Attorney-Advisor, Office on Violence Against Women, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Conforming STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program Regulations to Statutory Change; Definitions and Confidentiality Requirements Applicable to All OVW Grant Programs" (RIN1105-AB46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-206. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Recognition of Organizations and Accreditation of Non-Attorney Representatives" (RIN1125-AA72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-207. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report of the Attorney General to Congress Pursuant to the Death in Custody Reporting Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-208. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Visas: Classification of Immediate Family Members as A, C-3, G, and NATO Nonimmigrants" (RIN1400-AD96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 12, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-209. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Definition of Form I-94 to Include Electronic Format" ((RIN1651-AA96) (CBP Dec. 16-27)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-210. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Classification for Victims of Severe Forms of Trafficking in Persons; Eligibility for 'T'

Nonimmigrant Status" (RIN1615-AA59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-211. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Classification for Victims of Severe Forms of Trafficking in Persons; Eligibility for 'T' Nonimmigrant Status" (RIN1615-AA59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-212. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-213. A communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-214. A communication from the Acting Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tiered Pharmacy Copayments for Medications" (RIN2900-AP35) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-215. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Economic Report of the President together with the 2017 Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers; to the Joint Economic Committee.

EC-216. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Loan Programs Office, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loan Guarantees for Projects That Employ Innovative Technologies" (RIN1901-AB38) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-217. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Business Operations, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Roadless Area Conservation; National Forest System Lands in Colorado" (RIN0596-AD26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-218. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Stream Protection Rule" ((RIN1029-AC93) (Docket ID OSM-2010-0018)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-219. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6669)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-242. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes" (RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9369) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-243. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-4223)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-244. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aeronautics (Formerly Known as Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems) Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-6544)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-245. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-3820)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-246. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6895)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-247. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (42); Amdt. No. 3719" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-248. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (31); Amdt. No. 3721" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-249. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Camden, AL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2012-1308)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-250. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Murray, KY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6775)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-251. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Silver Springs, NV" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6413)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-252. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Illinois Towns; Carmi, IL; De Kalb, IL; Harrisburg, IL; Kewanee, IL; Litchfield, IL; Paris, IL; and Taylorville, IL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6985)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-253. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Arkansas Towns; Blytheville, AR; Brinkley, AR; Clarksville, AR; and DeQueen, AR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-4172)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-254. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Ohio Towns; Marion, OH; Portsmouth, OH; Van Wert, OH; and Versailles, OH" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8840)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-255. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Albany, OR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-3992)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-256. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Texas Towns; Levelland, TX; Vernon, TX; and Winters, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8828)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-257. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace for the following Texas Towns; Georgetown, TX; Corpus Christi, TX; Dallas/Fort Worth, TX; Gainesville, TX; Graford, TX; Hebbronville, TX; and Jasper, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8827)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-258. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Savannah, GA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9101)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-259. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Eugene, OR, and Corvallis, OR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-3991)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-260. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Establishment of Restricted Areas; Chincoteague Inlet, VA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-2776)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-261. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of and Modification to Restricted Areas; Fort Sill, OK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-3680)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-262. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Minimum Training Requirements for Entry-Level Commercial Motor Vehicle Operators" (RIN2126-AB66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-263. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commercial Driver's License Drug and Alcohol Clearinghouse" (RIN2126-AB18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-264. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Update of Overflight Fees" (RIN2120-AK53) (Docket No. FAA-2015-3597) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-265. A communication from the Director, Contract and Grant Policy Division, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contractor Financial Reporting of Property" (RIN2700-AE33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-266. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Railroad Police Officers" (RIN2130-AC62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-267. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications" (RIN0648-XE695) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-268. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Framework Adjustment 55 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements; Updates Annual Catch Limits for Sectors and the Common Pool for Fishing Year 2016" (RIN0648-XE632) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-269. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2016-2018 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications" (RIN0648-XE336) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-270. A communication from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's decision to enter into a contract with a private security screening company to provide screening services at Bozeman Yellowstone International Airport (BZN), Glacier Park International Airport (FCA), and Yellowstone Airport (WYS); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-271. A communication from the Acting Deputy Chief Financial Officer, National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedule of Fees for Access to NOAA Environmental Data, Information, and Related Products and Services" (RIN0648-BG39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(RIN0648-BG39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-272. A communication from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Director for Financial Management, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation" (RIN0605-AA47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. LEE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 21. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 22. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in the State of Nevada except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 23. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adopt and implement a standard identification protocol for use in the tracking and procurement of biological implants by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 24. A bill to expand eligibility for hospital care and medical services under section 101 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to include veterans who are age 75 or older, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 25. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for employers establishing workplace child care facilities, to increase the child care credit to encourage greater use of quality child care services, to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities, and to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 26. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of

certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARPER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 27. A bill to establish an independent commission to examine and report on the facts regarding the extent of Russian official and unofficial cyber operations and other attempts to interfere in the 2016 United States national election, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 28. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the permissible use of health savings accounts to include health insurance payments and to increase the dollar limitation for contributions to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 29. A bill to permit disabled law enforcement officers, customs and border protection officers, firefighters, air traffic controllers, nuclear materials couriers, members of the Capitol Police, members of the Supreme Court Police, employees of the Central Intelligence Agency performing intelligence activities abroad or having specialized security requirements, and diplomatic security special agents of the Department of State to receive retirement benefits in the same manner as if they had not been disabled; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FLAKE)):

S. 30. A bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Federal sex offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. HARRIS)):

S. 31. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S.J. Res. 3. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which requires (except during time of war and subject to suspension by Congress) that the total amount of money expended by the United States during any fiscal year not exceed the amount of certain revenue received by the United States during such fiscal year and not exceed 20 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States during the previous calendar year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. STABENOW,

Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. Res. 6. A resolution objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and to all efforts that undermine direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians for a secure and peaceful settlement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Con. Res. 4. A concurrent resolution clarifying any potential misunderstanding as to whether actions taken by President-elect Donald Trump constitute a violation of the Emoluments Clause, and calling on President-elect Trump to divest his interest in, and sever his relationship to, the Trump Organization; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, *supra*.

S. 17

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 17, a bill to ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to information.

S.J. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 5, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of Israel.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 28. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the permissible use of health savings accounts to include health insurance payments and to increase the dollar limitation for contributions to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about legislation I am introducing, the Health Savings Account Expansion Act.

Earlier this month, individuals across this country were once again faced with fewer choices and increased costs when purchasing health insurance coverage. Unfortunately, this has been a common occurrence since the Affordable Care Act's inception, but no State, I can tell you, is feeling the pinch more than my State of Arizona. Prior to the flawed rollout of the exchanges in 2013, Arizona had 24 health insurance companies offering plans in the individual market. Just last year, residents in Arizona's most populous county Maricopa, where I live, had only 8 private providers to choose from on the exchange—so from 24 to 8. Then, if that wasn't bad enough, a few months ago, individuals all across Arizona received notification that their insurance plans were no longer being offered, despite the current administration's hollow promise that they could keep their plans. Now nearly stripped of their preferred health insurance, residents in 14 of 15 Arizona counties—14 out of 15 counties—logged into the ObamaCare exchanges to shop for new plans only to discover that instead of the vibrant marketplace they used to have, they were left with only one insurer to choose from—so from 24 to 8, to 1 for 14 of Arizona's 15 counties.

So today, when I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle talking about preserving this wonderful program, I am saying "What State of denial do you live in?" because it is certainly not working in Arizona. In fact, Pinal County in Arizona briefly held the unfortunate distinction as the only county in America without a single insurer willing to offer plans on its exchange, not a single one. Fortunately, a few months later, one stepped in—just one. Of the plans that were ultimately made available to Arizonans on the exchange, the average policy came with a premium hike of nearly 50 percent—an average of nearly 50 percent. With only one game in town, there was no shopping around for a better deal.

To help put this in perspective, I would like to compare the average cost of health care coverage in Arizona to one of the most important purchases a family will ever make, and that is a home. Throughout most counties in Arizona, it is now cheaper to put a roof over your family's head than it is to pay your monthly health insurance premium under ObamaCare.

Let me say that again. Throughout most counties in Arizona, it is now cheaper to put a roof over your family's head than it is to pay your month-

ly health insurance premium under ObamaCare. This is for Maricopa County. It is the county in which I live and includes Phoenix. Homeowners can expect to pay nearly \$500 more per month on their health insurance than they do on their house—\$500 more on their health insurance than they do on their house. This is for the ObamaCare silver plan premium. This is a family—age 40 with two children. So that's about the median, and this is the median mortgage payment with respect to Maricopa County—\$500 more.

Let's see the visual for Pima County. Pima County is home to Tucson. Health care premiums ran an average family \$100 more per month than their mortgage. So in Pima County you are still paying more—\$100 more for your health insurance premium than you are for your mortgage.

Then there is Pinal County, the third largest in Arizona. According to Arizona's Department of Insurance, the average premium for a silver plan in Pinal County for the average family of four is over \$1700. That is double the median monthly mortgage payment for the same county. If you live in Pinal County, AZ, you are paying twice as much for your health insurance premium.

Keep in mind, we are talking about the premium, to say nothing of what happens when you go to the hospital or to your doctor and you have to pay deductibles that are through the roof or co-pays that people have never experienced before. So when they utilize that coverage they paid for with their premium, they realize they can't afford that either.

The situation isn't unique to these counties, the three most populous counties in Arizona. In all 15 of Arizona's counties, premiums for a family of 4 dramatically exceed the median monthly mortgage.

It is unacceptable for the Federal Government to force families to spend upwards of \$1,700 per month of their hard-earned income on a substandard product without options or choices, only to then slap them with a draconian penalty that they simply can't afford to pay for an untenable law.

Arizona is, without a doubt, ground zero for the structural failures that are plaguing insurance markets around the country. Insurance exchanges are on the verge of collapsing; premiums, deductibles, out-of-pocket expenses are skyrocketing; and our health care system is in desperate need of reform. That is why I stand here today to introduce the Health Savings Account Expansion Act.

The Health Savings Account Expansion Act goes a long way toward reforming our health care system by putting consumers back in charge of their own health care. The bill provides individuals and families with freedom to choose the health care that best meets their needs and allows them to use their health savings accounts on medical products and services they value most.



HSAs give consumers greater control over their health care dollars by providing them with a tax-advantaged savings option for their medical expenses. This means that the dollars they work so hard to save can grow over time, tax free, and can be withdrawn tax free for qualified medical expenses. The HSA Expansion Act strengthens this important tool by nearly tripling the arbitrarily low contribution limits, thus allowing for greater tax equity and more universal participation in HSAs. The bill would then allow individuals to use these expanded HSAs to help cover the costs of their monthly health insurance premiums. This is a critically important feature, particularly for middle-class families whose incomes fall slightly above the qualified threshold for subsidies but whose health insurance has become unaffordable.

In Arizona, I like to go to the gym in the morning, and I like to get on an exercise bike. By that bike is kind of a hallway where people will walk by. Inevitably, in the morning, I will have a lineup of people who will stand to tell me their ObamaCare horror stories—how much their premiums have gone up or that they no longer have any options or that they have had to pay the penalty or that when they go to utilize their care, they simply can't afford the co-pays and deductibles. I can tell you, it is sobering to hear these stories again and again and again.

In addition to further incentivizing prudent savings for health expenses, this legislation repeals existing restrictions put in place by ObamaCare on over-the-counter medications while also reducing the penalty for withdrawing HSA funds for nonqualified purchases. These reforms will help streamline HSAs while also making them more user-friendly for consumers.

Arizonans are struggling. They are struggling under the weight of bureaucracy that is complicating their health care decisions that are some of the most personal and important decisions individuals make for themselves and their families. If we hope to lift that burden off the backs of our constituents, we have to recognize that the key to reforming our health care system is not more government intervention; rather, it is allowing individuals the freedom to take back control of their health care and incentivizing prudent decisionmaking.

As the Senate looks to repeal this disastrous law and replace it with real reforms that would successfully lower health care costs and improve choice, I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that this legislation is included in those negotiations.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FLAKE)):

S. 30. A bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Fed-

eral sex offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Extending Justice for Sex Crime Victims Act, a bill to extend the time for minors to seek justice against their perpetrators.

Sex crimes committed against children tragically remain a vile and dangerous reality in communities across this country.

Just this past summer, as the world tuned into the 2016 Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro, the Indianapolis Star reported that USA Gymnastics had failed to report to law enforcement allegations of child sexual abuse committed by some of its coaches.

Due to these purported failures, athletes as young as 7 years old were reported to have been abused for years, without any action taken to prevent the abuse.

Since the initial Indianapolis Star report, more and more young gymnasts have come forward about their abuse.

All over the world, and all over this country, sex abuse victims are bravely coming forward to tell their stories of abuse when they were children.

In my home state of California, numerous victims have contacted my office. They have shared the amount of courage and strength it took to finally come forward with their experiences.

These stories represent an untold amount of pain and suffering. They also represent how difficult it is to come forward until later, in adulthood.

It has been estimated that 90 percent of child sex crime victims never go to the authorities concerning their abuse.

To put this into context, studies indicate that at least one in four girls and about one in five boys is sexually abused. 90 percent of those victims never go to the authorities.

A great number of victims don't ever disclose their abuse. If they do, they do not come forward until many years later, after reaching adulthood.

This bill extends the civil statute of limitations in two ways for minor victims of Federal sex crimes to seek justice against their perpetrators.

For one, the bill extends the statute of limitations for minor victims until the age of 28, from age 21, for injuries stemming from sex crimes such as sexual abuse and child pornography.

Second, for the two laws that provide civil remedies for sex abuse and sex trafficking victims, the bill clarifies that the statute of limitations does not begin to run until after the victim actually discovers the injury or the violation.

This is significant because victims of sex crimes are sometimes abused even before they can remember the abuse, some as young as 3 years old. Some victims are unable to connect their abuse to the injurious symptoms they exhibit throughout their lives.

The bill therefore clarifies that the limitations period begins when the victim first discovers the injury or the violation.

Through these provisions, the bill ensures that minor victims have an extended period to seek justice against their perpetrators after discovering their injury or violation.

I want to thank Senator CORNYN again for working so closely with me on this issue. I also want to thank the cosponsors to this bill: Senators KLOBUCHAR, INHOFE, FRANKEN, FLAKE, GILLIBRAND, TILLIS, and MARKEY.

I also want to acknowledge the support for this bill from the National Center for Victims of Crime, Rape Abuse & Incest National Network, the National Children's Advocacy Center, SGS for Healing, National Crime Victim Law Institute, National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators, National Network to End Domestic Violence, Stop the Silence, PROTECT, the National Association to Protect Children, Rights4Girls, End Rape on Campus, National Children's Alliance, Lauren's Kids, Minnesota Coalition Against Sexual Assault, and Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests.

By Mr. WYDEN (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. HARRIS)):

S. 31. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill, the West Coast Ocean Protection Act, which would amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit the Department of the Interior from issuing a lease for offshore oil or gas in federal waters off the coast of California, Oregon, or Washington.

I am pleased to be joined today by Senators WYDEN, MERKLEY, CANTWELL, MURRAY, and HARRIS in sponsoring this bill, which has been reintroduced in every Congress since 2010.

The original impetus for this bill was the Deepwater Horizon catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico in April of 2010, which demonstrated yet again the risks of offshore oil and gas extraction.

When the Deepwater Horizon well blew out, 11 people died and 17 others were injured. Oil and gas rushed into the Gulf of Mexico for 87 days.

Oil slicks spread across the Gulf of Mexico, tar balls spoiled the pristine white sand beaches of Florida, wetlands were coated with toxic sludge, and more than one-third of federal waters in the Gulf were closed to fishing.

While Deepwater Horizon served as an important reminder, the dangers of offshore oil and gas were already too well known to Californians. In 1969, the Santa Barbara oil spill leaked up to 100,000 barrels of oil, and remains the third largest oil spill in the country to this day.

Like the Deepwater Horizon, the Santa Barbara oil spill was caused by a natural gas blowout when pressure in the drill hole fluctuated.

It took 11 days to plug the hole with mud and cement, but oil and gas continued to seep for months.

Using containment technologies still in place today, the cleanup effort relied on skimmers, detergent, and booms.

There has been no new drilling in waters controlled by the State of California since then, and there has been no new drilling in Federal waters off the coast of California since 1981.

Appropriately, the most recent plan from the Department of the Interior for Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing will not allow new leasing off the Pacific Coast of California, Oregon or Washington through 2022.

The fact is that those of us on the Pacific coast do not want any further offshore oil or gas development.

In 2012 California's 19 coastal counties generated \$662 billion in wages and \$1.7 trillion in GDP. This accounts for 80 percent of the economic activity in the State.

California's Ocean economy, including tourism, recreation, and marine transportation, accounts for over 489,000 jobs.

Unlike other areas of the country, any potential fossil fuel resources off the coast of California are likely to be found within only 50 miles of the coast, because of the narrow shelf off the California coast. This means that any potential drilling, and any potential spills, would be in direct conflict with the ocean environment and economy that my state enjoys.

Enacting a permanent ban on offshore drilling would protect our coast for generations to come.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 6—OBJECTING TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2334 AND TO ALL EFFORTS THAT UNDERMINE DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE PALESTINIANS FOR A SECURE AND PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 6

Whereas it is long-standing policy of the United States Government that a peaceful

resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict must come through direct, bilateral negotiations without preconditions for a sustainable two-state solution;

Whereas President Barack Obama expressed before the United Nations General Assembly in 2011 that "peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations—if it were that easy, it would have been accomplished by now";

Whereas Yasser Arafat committed by letter dated September 9, 1993, to then Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, "The PLO commits itself to the Middle East peace process and to the peaceful resolution of the conflict between the two sides and declares that all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved by negotiation";

Whereas the United Nations has taken a long-standing biased approach towards Israel, confirmed in outgoing Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon's final address to the United Nations Security Council, when he described the "disproportionate" volume of resolutions targeting Israel and stated that "decades of political maneuvering have created a disproportionate number of resolutions, reports, and committees against Israel";

Whereas the United Nations is not the appropriate venue and should not be a forum used for seeking unilateral action, recognition, or dictating parameters for a two-state solution, including the status of Jerusalem;

Whereas it is long-standing practice of the United States Government to oppose and veto any United Nations Security Council resolution dictating terms, conditions, and timelines on the peace process;

Whereas it is also the historic position of the United States Government to oppose and veto one-sided or anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas efforts to impose a solution or parameters for a solution will make negotiations more difficult and will set back the cause of peace;

Whereas the Obama Administration's decision not to veto United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 (2016) is inconsistent with long-standing United States policy and makes direct negotiations more, not less, challenging;

Whereas several United States administrations have articulated principles as a vision for achieving a two-state solution, including addressing borders, mutual recognition, refugees, Jerusalem, and ending all outstanding claims;

Whereas Israel is a vibrant democracy whose leaders are elected and accountable to the Israeli people; and

Whereas the Palestinian Authority must engage in broad, meaningful, and systemic reforms in order to ultimately prepare its institutions and people for statehood and peaceful coexistence with Israel: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) expresses grave objection to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 (2016);

(2) calls for United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be repealed or fundamentally altered so that it is no longer one-sided and allows all final status issues toward a two-state solution to be resolved through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties;

(3) rejects efforts by outside bodies, including the United Nations Security Council, to impose solutions from the outside that set back the cause of peace;

(4) demands that the United States ensure that no action is taken at the Paris Conference on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict scheduled for January 15, 2017, that imposes an agreement or parameters on the parties;

(5) notes that granting membership and statehood standing to the Palestinians at the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other international institutions outside of the context of a bilateral peace agreement with Israel would cause severe harm to the peace process, and would likely trigger the implementation of penalties under sections 7036 and 7041(j) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 (division K of Public Law 114-113);

(6) rejects any efforts by the United Nations, United Nations agencies, United Nations member states, and other international organizations to use United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to further isolate Israel through economic or other boycotts or any other measures, and urges the United States Government to take action where needed to counter any attempts to use United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to further isolate Israel;

(7) urges the current presidential administration and all future presidential administrations to uphold the practice of vetoing all United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to insert the Council into the peace process, recognize unilateral Palestinian actions including declaration of a Palestinian state, or dictate terms and a timeline for a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

(8) reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States to continue to seek a sustainable, just, and secure two-state solution to resolve the conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians; and

(9) urges the incoming Administration to work with Congress to create conditions that facilitate the resumption of direct, bilateral negotiations without preconditions between Israelis and Palestinians with the goal of achieving a sustainable agreement that is acceptable to both sides.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4—CLARIFYING ANY POTENTIAL MISUNDERSTANDING AS TO WHETHER ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT-ELECT DONALD TRUMP CONSTITUTE A VIOLATION OF THE EMOLUMENTS CLAUSE, AND CALLING ON PRESIDENT-ELECT TRUMP TO DIVEST HIS INTEREST IN, AND SEVER HIS RELATIONSHIP TO, THE TRUMP ORGANIZATION

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 4

Whereas article I, section 9, clause 8 of the United States Constitution (commonly known as the "Emoluments Clause") declares, "No title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or

Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.”;

Whereas, according to the remarks of Governor Edmund Randolph at the 1787 Constitutional Convention, the Emoluments Clause “was thought proper, in order to exclude corruption and foreign influence, to prohibit any one in office from receiving or holding any emoluments from foreign states”;

Whereas the issue of foreign corruption greatly concerned the Founding Fathers of the United States, such that Alexander Hamilton in Federalist No. 22 wrote, “In republics, persons elevated from the mass of the community, by the suffrages of their fellow-citizens, to stations of great pre-eminence and power, may find compensations for betraying their trust, which, to any but minds animated and guided by superior virtue, may appear to exceed the proportion of interest they have in the common stock, and to overbalance the obligations of duty. Hence it is that history furnishes us with so many mortifying examples of the prevalence of foreign corruption in republican governments.”;

Whereas the President of the United States is the head of the executive branch of the Federal Government and is expected to have undivided loyalty to the United States, and clearly occupies an “office of profit or trust” within the meaning of Article I, section 9, clause 8 of the Constitution, according to the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice;

Whereas the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice opined in 2009 that corporations owned or controlled by a foreign government are presumptively foreign states under the Emoluments Clause;

Whereas President-elect Donald J. Trump has a business network, the Trump Organization, that has financial interests around the world and negotiates and concludes transactions with foreign states and entities that are extensions of foreign states;

Whereas Michael Cohen, an attorney for Donald J. Trump and the Trump Organization, initially stated that the Trump Organization would be placed into a “blind trust” managed by Donald Trump’s children, Donald Trump, Jr., Ivanka Trump, and Eric Trump;

Whereas the very nature of a “blind trust” is such that the official will have no control over, will receive no communications about, and will have no knowledge of the identity of the specific assets held in the trust, and that the manager of the trust is independent of the owner, and as such the arrangement proposed by Mr. Cohen is not a blind trust;

Whereas, on November 30, 2016, President-elect Donald J. Trump announced on Twitter that “I will be holding a major news conference in New York City with my children on December 15 to discuss the fact that I will be leaving my great business in total in order to fully focus on running the country in order to MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN!”;

Whereas, on December 12, 2016, President-elect Donald J. Trump abruptly canceled the planned December 15, 2016 news conference, and has provided no set date for a future announcement;

Whereas, on December 12, 2016, President-elect Donald J. Trump stated on Twitter, “Even though I am not mandated by law to do so, I will be leaving my businesses [sic] before January 20th so that I can focus full time on the Presidency. Two of my children, Don and Eric, plus executives, will manage them. No new deals will be done during my term(s) in office”;

Whereas numerous legal and constitutional experts, including several former White House ethics counsels, have made clear that, notwithstanding the problems inherent in temporarily ceding control of the Trump Or-

ganization to his children, such an arrangement, in which the President-elect fails to exit the ownership of his businesses through use of a blind trust or equivalent, will leave the President-elect with a personal financial interest in businesses that collect foreign government payments and benefits, which raises both constitutional and public interest concerns;

Whereas Presidents Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, William J. Clinton, and George W. Bush have set the precedent of using true blind trusts, in which their holdings were liquidated and placed in new investments unknown to them by an independent trustee who managed them free of familial bias;

Whereas the continued intermingling of the business of the Trump Organization and the work of government has the potential to constitute the foreign corruption so feared by the Founding Fathers and to betray the trust of America’s citizens;

Whereas the intent of this resolution is to prevent any potential misunderstanding or crisis with regards to whether the actions of Donald J. Trump as President of the United States will violate the Emoluments Clause of the Constitution, Federal law, or fundamental principles of ethics; and

Whereas Congress has an institutional, constitutional obligation to ensure that the President of the United States does not violate the Emoluments Clause and is discharging the obligations of office based on the national interest, not based on personal interest: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) calls upon President-elect Donald J. Trump to follow the precedent established by prior Presidents and convert his assets to simple, conflict-free holdings, adopt blind trusts managed by an independent trustee with no relationship to Donald J. Trump or his businesses, or take other equivalent measures, in order to ensure compliance with the Emoluments Clause of the United States Constitution;

(2) calls upon President-elect Donald J. Trump not to use the powers or opportunities of his position as President-elect or President of the United States for any purpose related to the Trump Organization; and

(3) regards, in the absence of such actions outlined in paragraph (1) or specific authorization by Congress, dealings that Donald J. Trump, as President of the United States, may have through his companies with foreign governments or entities owned or controlled by foreign governments as potential violations of the Emoluments Clause.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, it is with a renewed sense of purpose that I reintroduce my resolution on the Emoluments Clause. It is a resolution intended to uphold the values and strictures of one of our most sacred documents. I am referring, of course, to the Constitution, the instrument that, in but a short time, President-elect Donald Trump will take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend.

Our Founding Fathers could not have been clearer that any Federal office holder of the United States must never be put in a position where he or she could be influenced by a foreign governmental actor. It was a concern made explicit by Alexander Hamilton’s writings in Federalist No. 22, in which he noted examples of republics that had been ruthlessly dismembered by their hostile neighbors who had paralyzed the victim republic by bribing its officers and officials.

The Founding Fathers addressed this grave concern by placing the Emoluments Clause within the Constitution as an explicit bar on foreign corruption and interference. Article I, section 9, clause 8 of the United States Constitution declares that:

No title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Longstanding precedent has made it plain that the President of the United States, as the head of the executive branch of the government, clearly occupies an “office of profit or trust”. As such, the Emoluments Clause clearly applies to and constrains whomever holds the office of the Presidency.

Past American presidents have recognized the danger of foreign corruption and interference, or merely the perception of corruption and interference, and have accordingly taken great pains to avoid even the appearance of impropriety with regard to their personal wealth and investments, ensuring that such investments never interfere with performing their duties as President of the United States. Presidents Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush all had their assets placed into blind trust while they were President. To fulfill his promises of greater government transparency, President Obama went even further and invested the vast majority of his funds in U.S. Treasury bonds.

The President-elect has claimed he will “absolutely sever” his ties to the Trump Organization, which has financial interests around the world and negotiates and concludes transactions with foreign states, as well as entities that are extensions of foreign states. We have a constitutional duty to ensure that he does. It is easy to imagine circumstances in which a foreign government will want to give President Trump a personal gift through his businesses with the intent to curry favor with him and seek to influence his decisions in ways that benefit them, instead of the American people—precisely the danger our Founding Fathers sought to protect against with the Emoluments Clause.

This is not an esoteric argument about rules that do not affect real people. Put simply, the American public has a right to know that the President of the United States is always acting in their best interest, and not take the risk that his actions are influenced by some benefit or gift from a foreign government like Russia or China. The citizens of this country need to know that when the President of the United States is making decisions about potential trade agreements, sending troops into war, or spending America’s great resources, those actions are motivated by the public interest, and not because they might advance or harm

the President's private pecuniary interests.

We should be concerned when the President-elect is connected to an organization that has dealings with countries and entities that are not interested in distinguishing between doing business with President Trump and the profit-making organization that bears his name. The President-elect's failure thus far to dispose of his business interests in a comprehensive fashion has left this door wide open, and we are already seeing indications that foreign companies and businesses are beginning to take advantage. Kuwait's National Day event, which has traditionally been held at the Four Seasons in Washington, D.C., was moved to the Trump International Hotel, allegedly because of pressure—or perhaps merely a suggestion—from the President-elect's associates. Similarly, Bahrain has chosen to schedule an event to take place at the Trump International Hotel.

News reports suggest that one day after a phone call between President-elect Trump and the President of Argentina, permits under review for the Trump building in Buenos Aires were suddenly approved. In China, just days after the presidential election, Donald Trump scored a legal victory in a decade-long trademark dispute over the right to use the Trump name for real estate agent services in commercial and residential properties in China. The timing of these actions is interesting, to put it mildly.

I sincerely regret the necessity of reintroducing this resolution. Just after Thanksgiving, when President-elect Trump held a press conference to state that on December 15, 2016, he would make an announcement about his future with the Trump Organization, I publicly said how encouraged I was to see the President-elect's positive response. When I first introduced this resolution, my intent was to create an opportunity for the President-elect to act and remove this as an issue, so that he could put aside any appearance of impropriety and devote himself to good work on behalf of the American people. That is why I was disappointed when Mr. Trump abruptly canceled his December 15 announcement—and, as of today, he has not yet rescheduled it. This issue is far too critical to kick the can down the road, or to ignore, before an incipient violation of the Constitution becomes an actual violation.

Even before Mr. Trump's cancellation of his December 15 announcement, I was deeply concerned by statements he and his lawyers made with regard to the disposition of his numerous business interests. Mr. Trump's lawyers had initially announced that the Trump Organization would be placed into a "blind trust" managed by Donald Trump's older children. That arrangement is, unfortunately, by its terms the complete opposite of an actual blind trust. An actual blind trust is an arrangement which the official

has no control over, will receive no communications about, and will have no knowledge of the identity of the specific assets being held, and in which the trust's manager operates independently of the owner.

Around the same time President-elect Trump cancelled his December 15th announcement, he tweeted another idea for disposition of his businesses, stating that "[t]wo of my children, Don and Eric, plus executives, will manage them. No new deals will be done during my term(s) in office". Let me be absolutely clear: the arrangement tweeted by Mr. Trump is not sufficient and is hardly independent. Mr. Trump would be well-aware of the specific assets held, and he could receive communications about and take actions to affect the value of those assets. The idea that President-elect Trump's children, who are listed as members of his transition team and have already been present at meetings or phone calls with foreign leaders, can ever be truly "independent managers" is simply not a credible resolution of this concern.

This inadequate suggested arrangement is not a blind trust and will not ensure compliance with the Emoluments Clause of the United States Constitution. Indeed, numerous legal and constitutional experts, including Richard Painter, a former adviser to George W. Bush, have made clear that such an arrangement will leave the President-elect with a personal financial interest in businesses that collect foreign government payments and benefits. The notion that the American people should be satisfied by an unbinding promise that no new deals will be pursued—a promise that does not define what constitutes a "deal" and which can be reneged on at any time—does not pass the laugh test.

I must admit, I have also been quite disturbed and disappointed by the recent excuses and suggestions by surrogate speakers and supporters of the President-elect as to why no action need be taken and, indeed, by statements the President-elect has made himself. President-elect Trump has tweeted, [p]rior to the election it was well known that I have interests in properties all over the world." This is undoubtedly true. But the American people, in voting for a candidate, cannot—and, in fact, would not—want to excuse a potential future violation of the Constitution by that candidate. Indeed, I would say that President-elect Trump has this idea backwards. Prior to the election, he was well aware of the fact that he had interests in unique properties all over the world. Since the President-elect has referred to himself as "a constitutionalist," he must have known of the importance of complying with the Constitution by severing his foreign business connections in advance of his inauguration, which makes his continued failure and delay on this front all the more inexplicable.

On November 22nd, President-elect Trump stated, "The law's totally on

my side, meaning, the president can't have a conflict of interest." This regrettable statement selectively picks facts and shows a troubling disregard for the Constitution and for the duties owed to the American people. While the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and Federal judges may be granted specific, limited exemptions from conflicts of interest so that they may act and carry out their duties, that law does not supersede the Constitution nor, frankly, have anything to do with the very specific provisions of the Emoluments Clause, which are intended to prevent foreign governmental financial influence over the President.

Even as some of the President-elect's most trusted surrogates have acknowledged that the potential ethics challenges facing President-elect Trump are "a very real problem," they have persisted in arguing that Mr. Trump is somehow exempt from constitutional strictures, and even from the temptation of corruption itself, by virtue of his great wealth. For example, former Speaker Gingrich has claimed "that this is a new situation we've never seen before, and the rules [that] were written for people who were dramatically less successful literally do not work," while Mr. Trump's leading candidate to head the administration's Council of Economic Advisors has claimed that "[w]ealthy folks have no need to steal or engage in corruption." Really? That is a transparently false idea that one does not have to look very far to disprove. We need only glance at the countries where the Trump Organization has done business—places like Russia, Azerbaijan, Argentina, and Nigeria—to find numerous examples of already-wealthy government officials who have used their positions to lie, cheat, extort, and further enrich themselves and their families at the expense of the people they are supposed to be serving.

It was the enduring wisdom of our Founders to recognize that America is not magically immune from the corruption problems in other countries, and that not all men are angels. This is why we place our trust in the Constitution, not in individuals. A man with more wealth and extensive foreign holdings than prior presidents is, by an order of magnitude, more vulnerable to foreign corruption and interference than any president before him. The Emoluments Clause has greater bearing on Mr. Trump's presidency than his predecessors, not less.

No man can gain such wealth and power that he outgrows the limits of our Constitution. John Adams said it best: "We are a government of laws, and not of men." No matter our political or partisan sympathies, we all recognize that the Constitution is the law of the land, and that when the needs and ambitions of any man conflicts with the Constitution, the Constitution must win out.

It has also been suggested by some of Donald Trump's supporters that the

Emoluments Clause does not actually apply to the office of the Presidency. Not only does this conflict with longstanding understanding of the Emoluments Clause in the Executive Branch, it contravenes both the strict interpretation of the plain words of the Constitution, as well as the traditional values and practices adopted by previous presidents.

To get around the ethics challenges facing Mr. Trump, it has been suggested by the President-elect's supporters that a panel of five "experts" regularly monitor the Trump Organization businesses and tell the President "don't go over these bounds". It has even been suggested that the President-elect can simply sidestep ethics issues that clearly violate the law by pardoning advisors "if anyone finds them to have behaved against the rules". These 'ideas' are non-starters that cut dangerously against the plain intent of the Emoluments Clause. I am afraid they show a disregard for the values of our Constitution.

The solution to this problem is simple, not complex, and is set forth by my resolution: President-elect Trump has only to follow the precedents established by prior presidents and convert his assets to simple, conflict-free holdings; adopt blind trusts managed by truly independent trustees with no relationship to Mr. Trump or his businesses; or to take other, equivalent measures. This solution also has the benefit of having been successfully implemented by every modern president before Mr. Trump.

This resolution and its aims should not be viewed through the distorting prism of politics. I want the Trump administration to have the support from Congress to succeed on behalf of the American people. Nevertheless, I believe that Congress has an institutional, constitutional obligation to ensure that the President of the United States, whoever that person may be, does not violate our Constitution, acts lawfully, and is discharging the obligations of the office based on the broad interests of the American people and not his or her own narrow, personal interests.

Despite the late hour—just days before the inauguration—it is still possible for President-elect Trump to live up to the values of the Constitution, give the American people the transparency they deserve, and completely sever his relationship with the Trump Organization before he takes the oath of office on January 20, 2017. To do so would avoid a constitutional crisis that would not serve the best interests of the President, Congress, or the American people. Therefore, I ask for prompt, bipartisan support to advance this vital resolution.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the con-

current resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 7. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

(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 2017.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

##### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.

Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

#### TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.

Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

#### TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care legislation.

Sec. 3002. Reserve fund for health care legislation.

#### TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 4001. Enforcement filing.

Sec. 4002. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.

Sec. 4003. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 4004. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

#### SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2026:

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

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

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,682,088,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$2,787,834,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,884,637,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,012,645,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,131,369,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,262,718,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,402,888,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,556,097,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,727,756,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,903,628,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2017: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$0.

(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 2017: \$3,308,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,227,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,104,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,177,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,152,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,091,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,216,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,203,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,091,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,127,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,265,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,265,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,265,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,265,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,265,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,265,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,265,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,265,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,265,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,265,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2017: \$582,570,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$477,050,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$409,980,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$314,540,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$232,080,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$140,670,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$41,860,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: -\$68,390,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: -\$191,380,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: -\$314,150,000,000.

(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 2017: \$20,034,790,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$20,719,451,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$21,326,280,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$22,018,470,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$22,775,170,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,596,110,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$24,553,462,050,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$25,523,091,900,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$26,431,371,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$27,445,091,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2017: \$14,593,320,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$15,151,404,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,734,220,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,428,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$17,210,990,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$18,087,150,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$19,083,597,410,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$20,105,084,600,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$21,151,091,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$22,324,428,000,000.

#### SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2017 through 2026 for each major functional category are:

##### (1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$623,910,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$603,716,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$618,347,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$601,646,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$632,742,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$617,943,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$648,198,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$632,435,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$663,703,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$646,853,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$679,968,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$666,926,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$696,578,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$678,139,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$713,664,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$689,531,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$731,228,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$711,423,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$750,069,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$729,616,000,000.

##### (2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,996,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$51,907,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,099,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,541,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,097,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$55,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,686,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$57,690,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,085,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$58,756,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,576,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$60,205,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,141,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,513,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,588,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$62,705,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,094,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$63,915,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,692,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$65,305,000,000.

##### (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,562,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,988,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,787,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,225,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,476,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,978,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,202,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,645,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,961,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,313,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,720,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,038,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,516,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,812,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,318,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,580,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,151,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,393,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,021,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,238,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,773,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,455,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,509,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,495,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,567,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,058,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,975,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,456,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,109,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,019,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,332,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,083,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,337,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,590,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,796,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,608,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,755,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,955,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,124,000,000.

##### (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,264,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,254,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,738,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,486,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,425,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,201,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,647,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,126,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,457,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,203,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,403,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,536,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,497,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,055,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,761,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$51,164,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,017,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$51,915,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,214,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,728,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,148,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,821,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,483,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,927,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,438,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,834,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,179,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,984,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,037,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,437,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,018,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,409,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,343,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,714,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,812,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,192,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,696,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,846,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,378,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,171,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,799,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,821,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,408,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$674,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,739,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, — \$840,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,143,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, — \$1,688,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,889,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, — \$2,003,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,772,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, — \$2,238,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$92,782,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$91,684,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$94,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$93,214,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$96,522,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$95,683,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$91,199,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$97,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$92,154,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$99,772,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$93,111,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$101,692,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$94,118,000,000.



(B) Outlays, \$103,431,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$95,143,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$105,313,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$96,209,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$107,374,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$97,323,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$109,188,000,000.  
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,723,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,477,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,228,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,277,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,457,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,862,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,941,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,011,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,384,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,048,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,825,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,831,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,288,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,535,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,756,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,787,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,245,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,285,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,751,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,037,000,000.  
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$104,433,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$104,210,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$108,980,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$112,802,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$112,424,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$110,765,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$114,905,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$113,377,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$116,921,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$115,591,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$119,027,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$117,545,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$121,298,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$119,761,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$123,621,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$122,001,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$126,016,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$124,359,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$128,391,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$126,748,000,000.  
(11) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$562,137,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$560,191,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$583,006,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$593,197,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$615,940,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$618,089,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$655,892,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$645,814,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$677,902,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$676,781,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$711,176,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$709,301,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$744,335,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$742,568,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$780,899,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$778,293,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$818,388,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$815,246,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$857,176,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$853,880,000,000.  
(12) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$600,857,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$600,836,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$600,832,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$600,762,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$667,638,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$667,571,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$716,676,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$716,575,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$767,911,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$767,814,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$862,042,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$861,941,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$886,515,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$886,407,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$903,861,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$903,750,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,007,624,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,007,510,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,085,293,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,085,173,000,000.  
(13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$518,181,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$511,658,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$524,233,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$511,612,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$542,725,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$534,067,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$558,241,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$549,382,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$571,963,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$563,481,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$590,120,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$587,572,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$599,505,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$592,338,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$609,225,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$597,287,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$630,433,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$619,437,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$646,660,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$641,957,000,000.  
(14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$37,199,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$37,227,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,124,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,141,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,373,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,373,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,627,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,627,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$50,035,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$50,035,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53,677,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,677,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,540,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,540,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,645,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,645,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,076,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,076,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,376,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$70,376,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$177,448,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$182,448,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$178,478,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$179,109,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$193,088,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$192,198,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$199,907,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$198,833,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$206,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$205,667,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$223,542,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$222,308,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$221,861,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$220,563,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$219,382,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$218,147,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$237,641,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$236,254,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$245,565,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$244,228,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,519,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,662,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,423,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$63,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,596,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,168,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,555,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,134,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$68,538,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,776,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$67,691,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$68,489,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$68,466,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,227,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,976,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$72,023,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$71,615,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$79,932,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$80,205,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,545,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,318,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,095,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,884,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,620,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$26,584,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$28,312,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,576,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$29,046,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,366,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$29,787,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,149,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$30,519,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,886,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$31,101,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$31,942,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,248,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$32,789,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,071,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$393,295,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$393,295,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$453,250,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$453,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$526,618,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$526,618,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$590,571,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$590,571,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$645,719,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$645,719,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$698,101,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$698,101,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$755,288,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$755,288,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$806,202,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$806,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$854,104,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$854,104,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$903,443,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$903,443,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$3,849,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$7,627,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$56,166,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$39,329,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$55,423,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$47,614,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$58,021,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$52,831,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$61,491,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$57,092,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$63,493,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$60,260,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$65,783,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$62,457,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$67,817,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$64,708,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$70,127,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$66,892,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$69,097,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, —\$68,467,000,000.

(20) New Efficiencies, Consolidations, and Other Savings (930):

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$122,832,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$64,732,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$486,210,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$293,575,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$602,060,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$476,642,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$795,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$651,871,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$1,097,280,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$895,141,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$1,121,290,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$1,031,080,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$1,270,830,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$1,154,668,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$1,635,520,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$1,409,151,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$1,833,970,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$1,647,543,000,000.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$87,685,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$87,685,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$88,347,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$88,347,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$80,125,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$80,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$81,468,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$81,468,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$84,183,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$84,183,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$86,292,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$86,292,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$87,518,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$87,518,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$91,245,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$91,245,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$99,164,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$99,164,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, —\$97,786,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, —\$97,786,000,000.

#### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

##### SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$826,048,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$857,618,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$886,810,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$918,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$950,341,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$984,537,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$1,020,652,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$1,058,799,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,097,690,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$1,138,243,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$805,366,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$857,840,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$916,764,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$980,634,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$1,049,127,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$1,123,266,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$1,200,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$1,281,840,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,369,403,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$1,463,057,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,663,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$5,673,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,021,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$5,987,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,205,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$6,170,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,393,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$6,357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,589,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$6,552,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,787,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$6,750,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,992,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$6,953,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,206,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$7,166,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,428,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$7,387,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,659,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$7,615,000,000.

##### SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$274,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$273,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$283,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$294,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$304,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$304,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$315,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$326,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$325,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$337,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$337,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$350,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$349,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$361,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$360,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$374,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$373,000,000.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

### SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(b) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than January 27, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving all such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

### SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(b) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than January 27, 2017, the committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

## TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

### SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and, in the Senate, make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for—

(1) in the Senate, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, conference reports, or motions related to health care by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026; and

(2) in the House of Representatives, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, or conference reports related to health care by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

### SEC. 3002. RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and

the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and, in the Senate, make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for—

(1) in the Senate, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, conference reports, or motions related to health care by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, provided that the cost of such legislation, when combined with the cost of any other measure with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under this paragraph, does not exceed the difference obtained by subtracting—

(A) \$2,000,000,000; from

(B) the sum of deficit reduction over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026 achieved under any measure or measures with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under section 3001(1); and

(2) in the House of Representatives, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, or conference reports related to health care by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, provided that the cost of such legislation, when combined with the cost of any other measure with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under this paragraph, does not exceed the difference obtained by subtracting—

(A) \$2,000,000,000; from

(B) the sum of deficit reduction over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026 achieved under any measure or measures with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under section 3001(2).

(b) EXCEPTIONS FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, and section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

## TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

### SEC. 4001. ENFORCEMENT FILING.

(a) IN THE SENATE.—If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2017 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2017, 2017 through 2021, and 2017 through 2026 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633).

(b) IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House of Representatives, if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 is adopted without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with respect to this concurrent resolution on the budget, for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act and applicable rules and requirements set forth in the concurrent resolution on the

budget, the allocations provided for in this subsection shall apply in the House of Representatives in the same manner as if such allocations were in a joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2017. The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2017 consistent with title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations consistent with title I for fiscal year 2017 and for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026 for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633).

### SEC. 4002. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget, or a statement filed under section 4001 shall include in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations of the applicable House of Congress amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the Senate and the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)), 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. 4003. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—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 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House of Congress.

(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 Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives 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 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress).

**SEC. 4004. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House or of that House to which they specifically apply, 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 either the Senate or the House of Representatives to change those rules (insofar as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate or House of Representatives.

**SA 2.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING ANY LIFETIME LIMITS ON HEALTH CARE COVERAGE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports, relating to preventing any lifetime limits on health care coverage, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

**SA 3.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING ANY LOSS OF CERTAIN HEALTH CARE SUBSIDIES UNTIL A REPLACEMENT LAW THAT PROVIDES AT LEAST THE SAME HEALTH CARE COVERAGE, HEALTH CARE AFFORDABILITY, AND COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE BENEFITS IS SIGNED INTO LAW.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports, relating to preventing any loss of subsidies that were authorized for individuals under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (including amendments made that Act) until a law that establishes a replacement

plan that provides the same or a greater level of access to health care coverage, health care affordability, and comprehensive health care benefits is signed into law by the President, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

**SA 4.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONTINUED FEDERAL FUNDING FOR MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO NEWLY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Federal funding for medical assistance provided by States under the Medicaid program to low-income, non-elderly individuals under the eligibility option established by the Affordable Care Act in section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII)) remains available to the same extent that such funding was available for fiscal year 2016 until a replacement plan that provides such individuals with the same or greater level of access to similarly affordable and comprehensive health care benefits is signed into law by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

**SA 5.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND PREVENTING TAX CUTS IN THE CASE OF THE LOSS OF HEALTH CARE COVERAGE DUE TO A REPEAL OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing tax cuts for corporations or for individuals with incomes equal to or greater than \$250,000 if there is any loss of health care coverage for Americans as a result of the repeal of all or part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for

those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

**SA 6.** Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

**SEC. BUDGET POINT OF ORDER ON CLOSING THE GAP IN COVERAGE IN THE MEDICARE PART D PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) provisions included in health reform legislation to close the gap in coverage (often referred to as the “donut hole”) in the Medicare prescription drug program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-101 et seq.) have saved over 5,000,000 seniors across the United States more than \$5,000,000,000 and have increased access to lifesaving medications; [(2) in Florida, 355,360 seniors saved \$351,000,000, or an average of \$987 per beneficiary, on prescription drugs in 2015; and]

(3) absent the protections provided by such provisions, seniors will have to choose between their health and other basic necessities, including food and housing.

(b) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any legislation that repeals the provisions included in health reform legislation to close the gap in coverage in the Medicare prescription drug program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-101 et seq.).

**SA 7.** Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

**SEC. BUDGET POINT OF ORDER ON CLOSING THE GAP IN COVERAGE IN THE MEDICARE PART D PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) provisions included in health reform legislation to close the gap in coverage (often referred to as the “donut hole”) in the Medicare prescription drug program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-10 et seq.) have saved over 5,000,000 seniors across the United States more than \$5,000,000,000 and have increased access to lifesaving medications; [(2) in Florida, 355,360 seniors saved \$351,000,000, or an average of \$987 per beneficiary, on prescription drugs in 2015; and]

(3) absent the protections provided by such provisions, seniors will have to choose between their health and other basic necessities, including food and housing.

(b) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any legislation that repeals the provisions included in health reform legislation to close the gap in coverage in the Medicare prescription drug program

under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–101 et seq.).

(c) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Tara Shaw and Matt Giroux from my staff be given all-access floor passes to the Senate floor during consideration of the budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 3.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jenna Sablan and Natalie Rico, detailees to the Budget Committee, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of S. Con. Res. 3.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mike Jones and Josh Smith from my staff be given all-access floor passes for the Senate floor during consideration of the budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 3.

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

### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, January 5; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 3.

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

### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:45 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 5, 2017, at 10 a.m.

### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

#### LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

REBECCA EMILY RAPP, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13, 2019, VICE SHARON L. BROWNE, RESIGNED.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GLENN FINE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE JON T. RYMER, RESIGNED.

#### CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

DAVID J. ARROYO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2022. (REAPPOINTMENT)

BRENT FRANKLIN NELSEN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2022. (REAPPOINTMENT)

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JESSICA ROSENWORCEL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2015. (REAPPOINTMENT)

#### SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

MICHAEL P. LEARY, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, VICE PATRICK P. O'CARROLL, JR., RESIGNED.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TULINABO SALAMA MUSHINGI, OF VIRGINIA, 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 SENEGAL, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA-BISSAU.

#### OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

CAROLYN N. LERNER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SPECIAL COUNSEL, OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL, FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

#### OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

ELIZABETH A. FIELD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, VICE PATRICK E. MCFARLAND, RESIGNED.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ROBERT P. STORCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY. (NEW POSITION)