

COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 765, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for penalties for the sale of any Purple Heart awarded to a member of the Armed Forces.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 936

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 936, a bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes.

S. 951

At the request of Mr. PAUL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 951, a bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1055

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1055, a bill to restrict the exportation of certain defense articles to the Philippine National Police, to work with the Philippines to support civil society and a public health approach to substance abuse, to report on Chinese and other sources of narcotics to the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of

1970 to clarify when the time period for the issuance of citations under such Act begins and to require a rule to clarify that an employer's duty to make and maintain accurate records of work-related injuries and illnesses is an ongoing obligation.

S. 1137

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1137, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to include provisions relating to drinking water and wastewater infrastructure, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the largest organization of food and nutrition professionals in the world.

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 106, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate to support the territorial integrity of Georgia.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1144. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage business creation by allowing faster recovery of start-up and organizational expenses, to simplify accounting methods for small businesses, to expand expensing and provide accelerated cost recovery to encourage investment in new plants and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, there is no doubt that the last 8 years were not good ones for the American economy. Yearly economic growth under the Obama administration averaged just under 1.5 percent. That is less than half the growth needed for a healthy economy. That kind of weak growth has consequences: fewer jobs, fewer opportunities, and lower wages.

Wage growth was almost nonexistent during the Obama administration, and new jobs and opportunities were few and far between. There have been a few encouraging signs since the election. Both wage and job growth have shown some improvement, but we are still a long way from getting our economy back to full health. The GDP report for the first quarter of this year underscored the need to implement the kind of progrowth policies that were lacking during the Obama years.

One major way to spur economic growth and improve the health of our economy is to reform our Nation's Tax Code. Our current Tax Code is strangling businesses, both large and small. Our Nation has the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world, putting American businesses at a competitive disadvantage in the global economy.

Small businesses and family farms face high tax rates, at times exceeding those paid by large corporations. These tax policies have consequences. A small company that owes a large tax bill to the Federal Government is unlikely to be able to come up with the capital necessary to expand the business or hire new workers.

When American businesses are taxed at a far higher rate than their foreign counterparts, it is likely to be the foreign rather than the American company that expands and thrives. Tax reform needs to address these obstacles to growth. Later this year, the Senate plans to consider a major tax reform package. Two of the most powerful tax-related things we can do to increase economic growth are lowering business tax rates and allowing business to recover their investments in inventory, machinery, and the like faster.

The Senate tax bill will do both. Today, I am introducing legislation that I hope will be a part of the final tax reform package in the Senate. My bill—I am calling it the Investment in New Ventures and Economic Success Today Act, or the INVEST Act for short—focuses on helping small- and medium-sized businesses by allowing them to recover their costs faster.

Earlier this year, the Economic Innovation Group released a report on economic dynamism. Economic dynamism, as the Economic Innovation Group defines it, refers to the rate at which new businesses are born and die. In a dynamic economy, the rate of new business creation is high and significantly outstrips the rate of business deaths, but that hasn't been the case in the United States lately.

New business creation has significantly dropped over the past several years. Between 2009 and 2011, business deaths outstripped business births. While the numbers have since improved slightly, the recovery has been poor and far from historical norms.

The Economic Innovation Group notes that 2012, the economy's best year for business creation since the recession, "fell far short of its worst year prior to 2008." Well, this is deeply concerning because new businesses have historically been responsible for a substantial part of the job creation in this country, not to mention a key source of innovation.

When new businesses are not being created at a strong rate, workers face a whole host of problems. A less dynamic economy—the Economic Innovation Group notes—"is one likely to feature fewer jobs, lower labor force participation, slack wage growth, and rising inequality, exactly what we see today."

Again, that is from the Economic Innovation Group.

Well, starting a new business always has a substantial element of risk. We don't need to make it harder by throwing up tax and regulatory obstacles. If we want to see our economy thriving again, we need to be encouraging the creation of new businesses, but our Tax Code, too often, does the opposite.

My bill, the INVEST Act, would encourage new business creation by allowing new enterprises to deduct a substantial part of their startup costs within the first year. Under current law, new businesses are only able to deduct \$5,000 of their startup costs within their first year. Any startup expenses above that amount can be deducted, but that deduction is stretched out over a 15-year period. That is a long time.

The faster a new business can recover its startup costs, the faster it can establish itself on a secure footing. Entrepreneurs are far more likely to take the risk of starting a new venture if they know they will be able to recover their startup costs quickly. My bill would substantially increase the amount of a business's startup costs that can be deducted in the first year from \$5,000 to \$50,000.

Plus, any additional startup costs can be deducted over a 10-year period instead of the current 15. This will go a long way toward encouraging new business creation and the economic dynamism that comes along with it.

The second part of my bill focuses on increasing cashflow for businesses, farms and ranches, and particularly those that operate as corporations and partnerships, by allowing them to use the so-called cash method of accounting. Under current law, these businesses, farms, and ranches are generally forced to use what is called accrual accounting. Basically, what that means is, a business has to pay tax on income before it receives the cash, and it cannot deduct all of its expenses when it pays the invoice.

For a company with inventory, this means it has to deduct the investments it makes over an extended period of time. A small business might have to spend the majority of its available cash on inventory but be unable to fully deduct that expense until all of that inventory is sold.

In the case of some businesses, it might be well beyond the current tax year before that substantial investment can be fully deducted. That can leave a business increasingly cash poor. Cash poor businesses don't expand. They don't hire new workers. They don't increase wages.

Well, the INVEST Act would allow businesses to deduct investments and inventory up front, leaving them with more cash on hand to put back into their operations. It would also reduce the need for businesses to hire armies of lawyers and accountants to ensure that they have properly adhered to complex accounting rules.

Finally, the INVEST Act would substantially reform the depreciation and expensing rules. Traditionally, farms and businesses have been forced to deduct expenses like machinery, property, or agricultural equipment over an extended period—anywhere from 5 to 10 years or as many as 39 years for commercial buildings. That could leave a farm or a business with its cash tied up for years in all the property it takes to run the enterprise. Of course, that means a farm, LLC, or S corporation can spend years without being able to increase its investment in a business or to hire new workers.

My bill would permanently allow all businesses to deduct 50 percent of their investment in equipment, vehicles, machinery, and certain other kinds of property during the year in which they are purchased. It would also help small and medium-sized farms and businesses to recover an even greater portion of their capital investments by allowing them to deduct at least \$2 million of new investments in business property.

My bill expands current law so additional building improvements—things like roofs, heating, and air conditioning units would qualify for immediate expensing. Farmers and ranchers who may reach the limit on full expensing are not forgotten either. The bill substantially increases the rate at which they can deduct the costs of tractors, combines, and other machinery.

Finally, for those farms and businesses that rely on cars, light trucks, and vans, this bill would substantially increase the amount of their vehicle investment that can be deducted when the business determines its taxable income each year. Currently, a light truck used on a farm or ranch could cost upwards of \$30,000. Yet a farmer is only allowed to deduct \$19,000 of that cost over the required recovery period for a business vehicle. My bill would substantially increase that limit to bring it more in line with the real-world costs of business vehicles.

These changes to expensing rules all have one goal: putting more money back in the hands of business owners—particularly, small business owners, farmers, and ranchers. Forcing business owners, farmers, and ranchers to lock up their capital for 5, 10, or nearly 40 years discourages growth and job creation. Under my bill, businesses, farms, and ranches would be able to redeploy that hard-to-raise capital back into business expansion, increase in wages, new jobs, and even new ventures.

The Congressional Budget Office predicts that the economy will grow at a rate of just 1.9 percent over the next 30 years. That is a full percentage point lower than the average growth rate over the past 50 years, which was over 3 percent, or between 3.2 and 3.5. That will mean decades of fewer jobs and opportunities, low wage growth, and a reduced standard of living. We don't want to resign ourselves to that, and we

don't have to. If we eliminate the antigrowth features of our Tax Code, if we lift the regulatory burdens facing American businesses and free up businesses to grow and create jobs, we can achieve a future of strong economic growth—the kind of strong growth that will fuel employment and wage growth, along with greater opportunities for American workers.

I hope the INVEST Act will help us develop the kind of tax reform legislation that will help us restore strong, sustainable economic growth, and I am looking forward to working with Chairman HATCH and all of my colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee to put together the final bill and to get it to the President.

It is time that we give the American people a tax code that actually works for them.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1150. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to impose a work requirement for able-bodied adults without dependents who are eligible for medical assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to talk today about the need for a work requirement in our Medicaid Program. In 1969, President Lyndon Johnson addressed the American people, and he talked about breaking the cycle of poverty. This is what President Johnson said:

I believe . . . that the key to success in this effort is jobs. It is work for people who want to work.

President Johnson, as we know, was a Democrat. He fervently believed that the people of Louisiana didn't want handouts. Most people want a chance to support themselves. President Johnson also believed that Medicaid, as originally envisioned, would be a safety net for the disabled, the elderly, and people with small children. Medicaid is not exactly that; it is dramatically different.

Whether you agree or disagree with what has happened to Medicaid, the fact is that it has turned into a health insurance program for about 20 percent of all Americans. Think about that. We have roughly 320 million people in our country, and fully 25 percent are on Medicaid. It gets bigger and bigger every year, and it gets more expensive every year. You can see that the numbers speak for themselves. You can see the trend. You can certainly see that we started in 1966, and you can particularly see the trend beginning in 1996 and its trajectory.

It also became more expensive. The cost of our Medicaid Program in 1966 was \$1 billion. That is a lot of money. This is the cost of last year: \$576 billion and climbing.

Let me talk about our State alone. In Louisiana, the cost of Medicaid has increased from \$5.9 billion in 2008 to \$10.7 billion today, and 65 percent of all of the babies born in Louisiana every year now are born on Medicaid. Think about that.

We know that Medicaid is a Federal-State program. The Federal Government puts up some of the money; the State puts up some of the money, as well. In Louisiana, we put up about one-third of the money. In Louisiana dollars, in 2008, we were putting up \$1.7 billion in State money. It is called the match for the Medicaid Program. Today, the State of Louisiana is paying \$3.3 billion. You can do the math. That is about a 10 percent increase every year.

If we are spending \$3.3 billion of State money, that means every year, just like clockwork, we have to come up with an extra \$330 million. I can tell you where that money comes from. It comes out of public schools, it comes out of universities, it comes out of our budget for roads, and it comes out of our budget for public safety.

We have a choice in America. Either Medicaid is going to be, as we originally envisioned it, a safety net for the old, the disabled, and mothers with babies or it is going to be a health insurance program for the masses.

If the American people and Congress decide that Medicaid is going to be a health insurance program for the general population, then it needs to operate as health insurance does in the private sector. In other words, able-bodied adult enrollees in Medicaid should be required to work in order to receive their benefits, if they are able.

I am filing a bill that is going to be entitled the "Medicaid Reform and Personal Responsibility Act of 2017." It is going to create a work requirement for Medicaid. My reason is simple. I want Americans to prosper. I don't want our people to remain mired in poverty. I want to break poverty's back by creating a system that doesn't force the American people to subsist on handouts from government, and the best way to do that is to provide an incentive for able-bodied Americans to know the dignity of work because a person without a job is neither happy, nor is he free.

I think my bill is a commonsense approach to reducing America's reliance on entitlement programs. The work requirement will be very simple. It will be similar to the program that we have in place—the work requirement we have in place right now for food stamps.

This is what my bill would require: If you are on Medicaid or want to receive Medicaid, and you are an adult between the ages of 18 and 55, and you are able-bodied, you are not disabled, and you don't have any dependents, you don't have any children—so if you are 18 to 55, you are not disabled, and you don't have any children, then in order to receive Medicaid or to continue to receive Medicaid, you have to either work 20 hours a week—not 40 hours a week but 20 hours a week—you have to look for a job or you have to go back to school if you don't want to work. Or if you don't want to go back to school or you don't want to look for a job or you

don't want to get a job, you have to perform community service for 20 hours a week. My goal is to get people off Medicaid and into the workforce, so they can support themselves and not need Medicaid.

I don't want to take Medicaid away from people in need. I do want fewer people to need Medicaid. So if you are disabled, if you are pregnant, if you are elderly, if you are caring for a child, my bill doesn't apply to you. I am not talking about telling a mother with a baby in her arms that she has to go find a job, and I am not going to ask an elderly person in a nursing home to leave the nursing home and go get a job in order to receive Medicaid. All my bill says is that if you are young by today's standards, between 18 and 55, you are able-bodied and you have no children or dependents, then you have to go get a job or you have to go to school or you have to perform community service.

I want to be very clear about something else. In my State, we have a lot of flood victims. We had terrible flooding last year. In my State, Louisiana, we have a depression in the oil and gas industry; indeed, we do throughout America, and I know we do in the great State of Alaska as well. I am not looking to add to their hurt. I am working very hard, as are you, Mr. President, to put our oilfield workers back to work and to get our flood victims the assistance they need to recover from the tragedy that has befallen them. This bill is not about them. This bill is about able-bodied adults between the ages of 18 and 55 who have no dependents and who have been unemployed for years, in many cases, by their own choosing.

Our country has grown a lot and evolved a lot since Medicaid was introduced in 1965. We now face new challenges, both at home and abroad. We know that. Medicaid has grown, as well, but it hasn't evolved in a positive way, in my opinion. Just 3 years after Medicaid was founded, we knew we were going to have a problem finding the money, given the exponential growth in the program, and more than 50 years later, it is way past time to do something about it.

We have to break the back of poverty. This is not about throwing people out into the cold. This is about helping them to know that they can get work because the best program—the best social program in the entire world is a job. By implementing a work requirement for able-bodied adults, Medicaid will evolve to the next logical step. Our goal ought to be to ensure, of course, that people are healthy. That is what Medicaid exists for, but if you are healthy, then the next step is to help you join the workforce.

The simple fact is, this is nothing new or extraordinary. We already have work requirements—required by acts of this Congress—for unemployment assistance, for welfare benefits, for subsidized housing, and for food stamps.

Now, these requirements have been a success. We all know that, not just for stemming the costs of those programs but also for helping people—helping Americans build careers.

Yet we do not have a requirement—a work requirement—for Medicaid. If my bill passes, we will. Work requirements exist because these programs are supposed to be safety nets. That is what a social program is, a safety net. They are not supposed to exist to permanently support you if you can support yourself.

Our social programs in America are meant to be bridges. In way too many respects, they have become parking lots. Medicaid costs are not just a national problem. The program's expansion is clipping the wings of States like Louisiana and like Alaska because, as I pointed out, the States have to put up a substantial amount of the money.

We are becoming a country in which people subsist instead of thrive because they don't know the rewards of work. We have become a country in which poverty is a way of life for way too many people. That is just sad. More than 50 years after Medicaid began, it is time to break the back of poverty once and for all. We can start with a work requirement for Medicaid.

Thank you.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rehabilitation expenditures for public school buildings to qualify for rehabilitation credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today I want to discuss legislation I am introducing, the School Infrastructure Modernization Act.

To claim the federal tax credit for historic preservation, a building renovation must be for a different purpose than that for which the building was previously used, a requirement known as the "prior use" rule. This bill waives that requirement for renovations of K-12 public school buildings. This will make it easier to restore historic-but-dilapidated school buildings across the country so our children have safe, modern spaces in which to learn.

As a Richmond City Council member and later Mayor, I faced challenges familiar to many municipalities—overcrowded schools, aging buildings, and limited dollars in the budget. But in one particular case, I and a group of local stakeholders identified a creative solution. On one hand we had an overcrowded Thomas Jefferson High School with in-zone and magnet students. On the other hand, we had a closed Maggie Walker High School that needed renovations. We put together a financing package that made use of federal and state historic tax credits to renovate Maggie Walker High School and satisfied the prior use rule by consolidating the magnet program from Thomas Jefferson into a new Maggie Walker Governor's School for Government and

International Studies. Today, some 20 years later, this is one of America's highest performing public high schools. Without the federal historic tax credit, this would have been too expensive to make happen.

This bill will make it easier to do similar projects around the country. More modern school buildings will bolster the quality of public education, and carrying out these projects will generate private sector infrastructure investment and jobs. In Virginia alone, according to a 2013 study, more than 800 K–12 schools are at least 50 years old, representing some 40% of all the K–12 schools in the Commonwealth.

As the Senate considers tax reform and a comprehensive infrastructure package, I encourage my colleagues to support this common-sense incentive that is good for education, good for infrastructure, and good for jobs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1158. A bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, April was Genocide Awareness and Prevention Month. It commemorated some of the most horrific genocides and atrocities of the 20th century: the siege of Sarajevo in April 1992, the Rwandan genocide in April 1992; the Cambodian genocide in April 1975; and, the Armenian genocide in April 1915. Last, Yom Hashoah or Holocaust Remembrance Day fell during the month of April this year.

We must remember the past. And we must also be mindful of the present and the future. As we know all too well, criminal atrocities persist around the globe. In South Sudan, the world's youngest nation, a political and ethnic conflict is now in its fourth year. Tens of thousands of civilians were killed in mass atrocities and thousands more have fled the country fearing for their lives. In Iraq, ISIS has committed genocide against Yazidis, Christians, and Shiite Muslims, a determination made by former U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry last year. ISIS has killed, expelled, raped, and enslaved Yazidi men, women, and children in northern Iraq, and has committed similar atrocities against other groups living in areas under its control.

In Burma, the Rohingya Muslim community faces such severe violence

and dehumanization, including slaughtering and sequestration, that many experts believe their suffering amounts to genocide. Moreover, in Syria, repeatedly, we see a government committing atrocities against its own people. Children are being gassed. Hospitals are being bombed. Innocent people are being tortured to death.

Too often, we have done too little, waited too long, or been caught unprepared by events that should not have surprised us. We continue to forget the lessons of the past and fail to live up to the post-Holocaust pledge of "Never Again." Ignoring the genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity that continue to rage around the world sends a message to the global community that criminal atrocities are tolerable. We must do better to see that atrocities never again occur on our watch.

On April 7, I introduced the Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act, which expands the tools the U.S. government is using to document atrocities in Syria and hold President Bashar al-Assad and other perpetrators accountable. Today, under the heavy cloud of atrocities occurring in South Sudan, Iraq, Burma, Syria, and elsewhere, I am introducing another atrocity-related bill, the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2017. This bill—named in honor of the courageous, inspiring Holocaust survivor and Nobel Laureate Elie Wiesel—strengthens the U.S. government's infrastructure to prevent and respond to mass atrocities, wherever they may occur.

I am here today to stress that our job, our responsibility, is to make sure the United States has the full arsenal of tools—diplomatic, economic, and legal—to take meaningful action before atrocities occur. The costs—both human and economic—of addressing these atrocities too late or after-the-fact are skyrocketing. The United States must do a better job of responding earlier and more effectively to these crimes—when warning signs begin to point towards possible atrocities occurring, and when strategic investments can have a greater impact in promoting stability and security. Essential to this effort is ensuring that the United States Government has structures in place and mechanisms at hand to better prevent and respond to potential atrocities.

Atrocity prevention has long been a bipartisan cause. In 1988, President Reagan signed implementing legislation allowing the United States to become a party to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. In the 2006 National Security Strategy, President George W. Bush highlighted the "moral imperative that states take action to prevent and punish genocide." In 2008, the bipartisan Genocide Prevention Task Force, which was co-chaired by former Secretary of Defense William Cohen and former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, stated: "Genocide and

mass atrocities . . . threaten core U.S. national interests." In 2010, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution recognizing "the United States national interest in helping to prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and other mass atrocities against civilians, and supporting and encouraging efforts to develop a whole of government approach to prevent and mitigate such acts." In 2011, President Obama declared: "Preventing mass atrocities and genocide is a core national security interest and a core moral responsibility of the United States of America." The same year, former U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations Samantha Power stated that preventing genocide "required a degree of governmental organization that matches the kind of methodical organization that accompanies mass killings."

We need to continue taking proactive steps to enhance our Nation's capacity to quickly anticipate and address genocide and other atrocity crimes. I am introducing the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2017 to ensure that we do just that. I am joined in this effort by Senators YOUNG, TILLIS, DURBIN, RUBIO, MENENDEZ, MURKOWSKI, BLUMENTHAL, WARREN, WHITEHOUSE, GILLIBRAND, KLOBUCHAR, SHAHEEN, FRANKEN, PETERS, COONS, STABENOW, BOOKER, MARKEY, BROWN, BALDWIN, and WYDEN. This bill does a number of things. First, the bill authorizes the creation of a Mass Atrocities Task Force, which is a transparent, accountable, proactive, high-level, interagency body that includes representatives at the assistant secretary level or higher from departments and agencies across the U.S. Government. The Task Force would work collaboratively with representatives of governmental as well as non-governmental organizations to oversee the development and implementation of U.S. policy on atrocity prevention and response.

Second, this bill gives our Foreign Service Officers the training they need to recognize patterns of escalation and early warning signs of potential atrocities and conflict. With this training, we will, over time, build atrocity prevention into the core skillset of our people on the ground. They will be better equipped to see warning signs, analyze events, and engage early.

Third, this bill calls on the Director of National Intelligence to include in his or her annual testimony to Congress on threats to U.S. national security a review of countries and regions at risk of mass atrocities as well as, whenever possible, specific risk factors, potential groups of perpetrators, and at-risk target groups. With this information, Congress will be better informed and better able to respond to mass atrocities that are brewing.

Finally, this bill authorizes the Complex Crises Fund, which is a specifically dedicated portion of our foreign assistance budget for mitigating conflict. The Complex Crises Fund enables

us to rapidly respond to emerging crises overseas, including potential atrocities. We have already used the Complex Crises Fund to respond to crises in the Central African Republic, Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea, Kenya, Sri Lanka, and elsewhere. Without this important tool, our ability to effectively prevent and mitigate crises is severely constrained.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. It does good things, and places the United States on solid moral ground. However, the moral argument is not the only reason to support this bill. We must also remember that America's security, and that of our allies, is impacted when civilians are slaughtered. Our security is impacted when desperate refugees stream across borders. Our security is affected when perpetrators of extraordinary violence wreak havoc on regional stability, destroying communities, families, and livelihoods. We have seen groups like ISIS systematically targeting communities because of their ethnicity or religious beliefs and practices, and yet, we still lack a comprehensive framework to prevent and respond to genocide and other atrocity crimes. So, let this bill act as our framework, and our call to action, so that when we use the phrase "never again," we know that we are taking meaningful preventative action.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mrs. McCASKILL):

S. 1162. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to announce the reintroduction of the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act of 2017. This legislation would allow student loan borrowers to take advantage of lower interest rates, and I urge both my Senate colleagues and the Trump administration to support it. In a few short months, millions more college graduates will be hit with their first student loan bills.

Already, more than 44 million Americans have student loans, and many are struggling to pay loans that are running at interest rates of 6 percent, 8 percent, 10 percent and even more. It is time for real action to help struggling

borrowers. That is why, today, I join 36 of my Democratic colleagues in the Senate and 98 of my Democratic colleagues in the House of Representatives to reintroduce our plan to allow borrowers to lower their monthly payment by refinancing their existing loans to today's lower interest rates, 3.76 percent for undergrads, a little higher for graduate students.

Supporting America's students should not be a political food fight. In fact, President Trump talked about student loans when he was on the campaign trail, including a plan to reduce the maximum number of years for repayment for most students.

As a candidate, Donald Trump said that "students should not be asked to pay more on the debt than they can afford." I agree with that, which is why Congress should allow students to lower their monthly payments by refinancing to today's lower interest rates. Donald Trump also said that "student loan debt should not be an albatross around student's necks for the rest of their lives."

I agree with that too. The legislation I am introducing today would lower the outstanding balance for millions of Americans, allowing them to get out from under their student loans faster. Here is one more. Donald Trump said that it is "terrible that one of the only profit centers we have is student loans." He also said that "it is not fair and that should not take place."

Unfortunately, right now, that is exactly what is happening. According to a recent analysis of Congressional Budget Office data by the Institute for College Access and Success, after all the costs are accounted for, the Federal Government is now on track to make \$81 billion off student loans over the next 10 years.

That is obscene. The Federal Government should not be making a profit off the backs of our students, period. Yes, Candidate Trump talked a lot about this problem, but talk is cheap, and President Trump has not done a thing to fix the problem. In fact, he seems to have lost all interest in students and their student loans. Since his election in November, he has not even mentioned his campaign promises about student loans.

Instead, he and Education Secretary DeVos have gone in the opposite direction, using their short time in office to deliver one blow after another to hard-working Americans who are struggling with student debt. Back when he was running for President, Donald Trump made a lot of promises, but empty promises don't help the students who have been punched in the gut by Secretary DeVos's decision to roll back critical consumer protections for borrowers.

Hollow campaign pledges do not help the students, the veterans, the members of our Armed Forces when they are hurt by student loan companies, like Navient, that break the law and brazenly announce to the world that

they don't think they have a responsibility to act in the best interests of students.

Rally speeches don't mean much when this administration is ripping up policies that would have made it harder for greedy student loan companies to rake in lucrative government contracts while cheating students. Last year's rhetoric means nothing to the struggling borrowers who can now be charged sky-high fees—as high as 16 percent—by student loan collection companies thanks to yet another policy Betsy DeVos ripped up.

Students know what is going on. The loan companies know too. Industry stocks have skyrocketed since November. Mr. President, keep your promise and start by supporting this refinancing bill.

For nearly 4 years, Republicans have filibustered this bill and refused to even debate it, despite its overwhelming public support. Meanwhile, congressional Republicans have offered nothing—nothing—to seriously address the problems of student loan borrowers. Those problems keep getting worse. Today's students are wrestling with \$1.4 trillion in student loan debt, and every year the student loan debt increases by nearly \$100 billion.

Interest rates are scheduled to jump up again later this summer, meaning the urgency for Congress to act and allow borrowers to access today's rates is stronger than ever. The Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act would give millions of borrowers across this country a chance to save hundreds and in some cases thousands of dollars a year. That is real money, money they can put toward paying down the balance on their debt, money they can use to save for a home, money they can spend on buying a car, money they can put toward building a solid future.

By refusing to act and ignoring this debt crisis, Republicans threaten to bury the hopes of an entire generation. It is time for Congress to step up and fix this problem. It is also time for the President to step up as well.

President Trump, you campaigned on the idea that the Federal Government should not be making a profit off the backs of hard-working students. So support this legislation. Put it in your annual budget, this proposal. Call on Members of your own party who have held up this bill to get on board. Demand action to refinance student loan debt, and keep the promises you made to America's young people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1163. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure compliance of medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs with requirements relating to the scheduling of appointments, to require appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate of certain

health care officials of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1163

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Health Care Integrity Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. COMPLIANCE OF MEDICAL FACILITIES WITH REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SCHEDULING OF APPOINTMENTS FOR HOSPITAL CARE AND MEDICAL SERVICES.

(a) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the director of each medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs annually certifies to the Secretary that—

(A) the medical facility is in full compliance with all regulations and other provisions of law relating to scheduling appointments for veterans to receive hospital care or medical services, including Veterans Health Administration Directive 1230 or any successor directive; and

(B) any official data on wait times for appointments to receive hospital care or medical services submitted by the director to the Secretary during the year preceding the submission of the certification is true and accurate to the best of the director's knowledge.

(2) PROHIBITION ON WAIVER.—The Secretary may not waive any regulation or other provision of law described in paragraph (1) for a medical facility of the Department if such regulation or other provision of law otherwise applies to the medical facility.

(b) EXPLANATION OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—If a director of a medical facility of the Department does not make a certification under subsection (a)(1) for any year, the director shall submit to the Secretary a report containing—

(1) an explanation of why the director is unable to make such certification; and

(2) a description of the actions the director is taking to ensure full compliance with the regulations and other provisions of law described in such subsection.

(c) PROHIBITION ON BONUSES BASED ON NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a director of a medical facility of the Department does not make a certification under subsection (a)(1) for any year, no covered official described in paragraph (2) may receive an award or bonus under chapter 45 or 53 of title 5, United States Code, or any other award or bonus authorized under such title or title 38, United States Code, during the year following the year in which the certification was not made.

(2) COVERED OFFICIAL DESCRIBED.—A covered official described in this paragraph is each official who serves in the following positions at a medical facility of the Department during a year, or portion thereof, for which the director does not make a certification under subsection (a)(1):

(A) The director.

(B) The chief of staff.

(C) The associate director.

(D) The associate director for patient care.

(E) The deputy chief of staff.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the

Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report containing, with respect to the year covered by the report—

(1) a list of each medical facility of the Department for which a certification was made under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) a list of each medical facility of the Department for which such a certification was not made, including a copy of each report submitted to the Secretary under subsection (b).

SEC. 3. UNIFORM APPLICATION OF DIRECTIVES AND POLICIES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall apply the directives and policies of the Department of Veterans Affairs to each office or facility of the Department in a uniform manner.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary does not uniformly apply the directives and policies of the Department pursuant to subsection (a), including by waiving such a directive or policy with respect to an office, facility, or element of the Department, the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives of such nonuniform application, including an explanation for the non-uniform application.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENT FOR APPOINTMENT AND CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY FOR HEALTH.—Subsection (c) of section 7306 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), appointments under subsection (a) shall be made by the Secretary.

"(2) Appointments under subsection (a)(1) shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(3) In the case of appointments under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (8) of subsection (a), such appointments shall be made upon the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Health."

(b) OTHER DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY POSITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Operations and Management of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Policy and Services of the Department, the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Benefits of the Department, the Deputy Under Secretary for Disability Assistance of the Department, and the Deputy Under Secretary for Field Operations of the Department shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the establishment of any new position within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) APPLICATION.—Subsection (b) and the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to appointments made on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FISCHER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1164. A bill to protect consumers from deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1164

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stop Online Booking Scams Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Internet has become an important channel of commerce in the United States, accounting for billions of dollars in retail sales every year.

(2) Hotel reservation transactions can be easily made online and online commerce has created a marketplace where consumers can shop for hotels, flights, car rentals, and other travel-related services and products across thousands of brands on a single platform.

(3) Consumers should be able to clearly identify the company with which they are transacting business online.

(4) Actions by third-party sellers that misappropriate brand identity, trademark, or other marketing content are harmful to consumers.

(5) Platforms offered by online travel agencies provide consumers with a valuable tool for comparative shopping for hotels and should not be mistaken for the unlawful third-party actors that commit such misappropriation.

(6) The misleading and deceptive sales tactics companies use against consumers booking hotel rooms online have resulted in the loss of sensitive financial and personal information, financial harm, and other damages for consumers.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) consumers benefit from the ability to shop for travel-related services and products on the innovative platforms offered by online travel agencies;

(2) sellers on the Internet should—

(A) provide consumers with clear, accurate information; and

(B) have an opportunity to compete fairly with one another; and

(3) the Federal Trade Commission should revise the Commission's Internet site to make it easier for consumers and businesses to report complaints of deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AFFILIATION CONTRACT.—The term "affiliation contract" means, with respect to a hotel, a contract with the owner of the hotel, the entity that manages the hotel, or the franchisor of the hotel to provide online hotel reservation services for the hotel.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(3) EXHIBITION ORGANIZER OR MEETING PLANNER.—The term "exhibition organizer or meeting planner" means the person responsible for all aspects of planning, promoting, and producing a meeting, conference, event, or exhibition, including overseeing and arranging all hotel reservation plans and contracts for the meeting, conference, event, or exhibition.

(4) OFFICIAL HOUSING BUREAU.—The term "official housing bureau" means the organization designated by an exhibition organizer or meeting planner to provide hotel reservation services for meetings, conferences, events, or exhibitions.

(5) **PARTY DIRECTLY AFFILIATED.**—The term “party directly affiliated” means, with respect to a hotel, a person who has entered into an affiliation contract with the hotel.

(6) **THIRD-PARTY ONLINE HOTEL RESERVATION SELLER.**—The term “third-party online hotel reservation seller” means any person that—

(A) sells any good or service with respect to a hotel in a transaction effected on the Internet; and

(B) is not—

(i) a party directly affiliated with the hotel; or

(ii) an exhibition organizer or meeting planner or the official housing bureau for a meeting, conference, event, or exhibition held at the hotel.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENTS FOR THIRD-PARTY ONLINE HOTEL RESERVATION SELLERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall be unlawful for a third-party online hotel reservation seller to charge or attempt to charge any consumer's credit card, debit card, bank account, or other financial account for any good or service sold in a transaction effected on the Internet with respect to a hotel unless the third-party online hotel reservation seller—

(1) clearly and conspicuously discloses to the consumer all material terms of the transaction, including—

(A) before the conclusion of the transaction—

(i) a description of the good or service being offered; and

(ii) the cost of such good or service; and

(B) in a manner that is continuously visible to the consumer throughout the transaction process, that the person—

(i) is a third-party online hotel reservation seller; and

(ii) is not—

(I) affiliated with the owner of the hotel or the entity that provides the hotel services or accommodations; or

(II) an exhibition organizer or meeting planner or the official housing bureau for a meeting, conference, event, or exhibition held at the hotel; or

(2) includes prominent and continuous disclosure of the brand identity of the third-party online hotel reservation seller throughout the transaction process, whether online or over the phone.

(b) **ENFORCEMENT BY COMMISSION.**—

(1) **UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.**—A violation of subsection (a) by a person subject to such subsection shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or deceptive act or practice prescribed under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(2) **POWERS OF COMMISSION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall enforce this section in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(B) **PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.**—Any person who violates this section shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(C) **RULEMAKING.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may promulgate such rules as the Commission considers appropriate to enforce this section.

(ii) **PROCEDURES.**—The Commission shall carry out any rulemaking under clause (i) in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) **ENFORCEMENT BY STATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of the

State has been or is being threatened or adversely affected by the engagement of any person subject to subsection (a) in a practice that violates such subsection, the attorney general of the State may, as *parens patriae*, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate relief.

(2) **RIGHTS OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—

(A) **NOTICE TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), the attorney general of a State shall notify the Commission in writing that the attorney general intends to bring a civil action under paragraph (1) before initiating any civil action against a person subject to subsection (a).

(ii) **CONTENTS.**—The notification required under clause (i) with respect to a civil action shall include a copy of the complaint to be filed to initiate the civil action.

(iii) **EXCEPTION.**—If it is not feasible for the attorney general of a State to provide the notification required by clause (i) before initiating a civil action under paragraph (1), the attorney general shall notify the Commission immediately upon instituting the civil action.

(B) **INTERVENTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—The Commission may—

(i) intervene in any civil action brought by the attorney general of a State under paragraph (1); and

(ii) upon intervening—

(I) be heard on all matters arising in the civil action; and

(II) file petitions for appeal of a decision in the civil action.

(3) **INVESTIGATORY POWERS.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent the attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of the State—

(A) to conduct investigations;

(B) to administer oaths or affirmations; or

(C) to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary or other evidence.

(4) **STATE COORDINATION WITH FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—If the Commission institutes a civil action or an administrative action with respect to a violation of subsection (a), the attorney general of a State shall coordinate with the Commission before bringing a civil action under paragraph (1) against any defendant named in the complaint of the Commission for the violation with respect to which the Commission instituted such action.

(5) **VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—

(A) **VENUE.**—Any action brought under paragraph (1) may be brought in—

(i) the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code; or

(ii) another court of competent jurisdiction.

(B) **SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—In an action brought under paragraph (1), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(i) is an inhabitant; or

(ii) may be found.

(6) **ACTIONS BY OTHER STATE OFFICIALS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to civil actions brought by attorneys general under paragraph (1), any other officer of a State who is authorized by the State to do so may bring a civil action under paragraph (1), subject to the same requirements and limitations that apply under this subsection to civil actions brought by attorneys general.

(B) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit an authorized official of a State from initiating

or continuing any proceeding in a court of the State for a violation of any civil or criminal law of the State.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, the travel and tourism industry is a pillar of Montana's economy. Our wealth of public lands, first-class fishing, hiking and skiing, and our breathtaking natural landscapes make Montana a special place for people to visit. Last year alone, visitors to Montana spent \$3.46 billion in our state. And Montana is not alone. The travel and tourism industry plays a significant role in the United States economy as well, contributing over \$503 billion to the U.S. GDP just last year.

With advancements in technology and the increased use of online marketplaces, travelers have the ability to do more research, plan trips, and book reservations online. Online platforms allow customers to compare thousands of brands in one place and as a result the number of hotel reservations made online has surged over the past several years, many of which are on legitimate third-party websites. However, as the ease and number of online bookings has increased, so has the number of online booking scams.

Illegitimate reservation sellers pose as hotel websites, leading consumers to believe they are booking directly with the hotel, when in fact they are booking with an unrelated third party. Transactions on these sites can result in additional hidden fees, loss of expected loyalty points, or even confirmation of reservations that were never made. One study found that as many as fifteen million bookings a year are affected by fraudulent websites. In Montana, you expect to get what you pay for. When you book a hotel online only to find out you are not on the list when you arrive, you not only lose your money, but you lose the positive experience tourism awards.

That is why I am proud to introduce the Stop Online Booking Scams Act of 2017 along with my colleagues Senators NELSON, FISCHER, and KLOBUCHAR. This bill requires third-party sites to disclose that they are not affiliated with the hotel, providing clarity and transparency to consumers booking online. It also empowers State attorneys general to pursue cases on behalf of consumers who have been scammed. Providing clear disclosures that reveal the true identity of websites will give confidence to the millions of consumers who make reservations online every year. I ask my colleagues who have not yet done so to join me in cosponsoring this much-needed legislation. Thank you, Mr. President.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1169. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with an option to provide medical assistance to individuals between

the ages of 22 and 64 for inpatient services to treat substance use disorders at certain facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1169

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Medicaid Coverage for Addiction Recovery Expansion Act”.

SEC. 2. STATE OPTION TO PROVIDE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR RESIDENTIAL ADDICTION TREATMENT FACILITY SERVICES; MODIFICATION OF THE IMD EXCLUSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(16)—

(A) by striking “and, (B)” and inserting “, (B)”; and

(B) by inserting “, and (C) effective January 1, 2019, residential addiction treatment facility services (as defined in subsection (h)(3)) for individuals over 21 years of age and under 65 years of age, if offered as part of a full continuum of evidence-based treatment services provided under the State plan, including residential, outpatient, and community-based care, for individuals with substance use disorders” before the semicolon; and

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (16) of subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (a)(16)(A)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) For purposes of subsection (a)(16)(C), the term ‘residential addiction treatment facility services’ means, subject to subparagraph (B), inpatient services provided—

“(i) to an individual for the purpose of treating a substance use disorder that are furnished to an individual for not more than 2 consecutive periods of 30 consecutive days, provided that upon completion of the first 30-day period, the individual is assessed and determined to have progressed through the clinical continuum of care, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, in consultation with the American Society of Addiction Medicine, and requires continued medically necessary treatment and social support services to promote recovery, stable transition to ongoing treatment, and discharge; and

“(ii) in a facility that is accredited for the treatment of substance use disorders by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities, the Council on Accreditation, or any other accrediting agency that the Secretary deems appropriate as necessary to ensure nationwide applicability, including qualified national organizations and State-level accrediting agencies.

“(B) The State agency responsible for administering the State plan under this title shall establish procedures to ensure that, with respect to any facility providing residential addiction treatment facility services in a fiscal year, the average monthly number of beds used by the facility to provide such services during such year is not more than 40.

“(C) The provision of medical assistance for residential addiction treatment facility

services to an individual shall not prohibit Federal financial participation for medical assistance for items or services that are provided to the individual in or away from the residential addiction treatment facility during any 30-day period in which the individual is receiving residential addiction treatment facility services.

“(D) A woman who is eligible for medical assistance on the basis of being pregnant and who is furnished residential addiction treatment facility services during any 30-day period may remain eligible for, and continue to be furnished with, such services for additional 30-day periods without regard to any eligibility limit that would otherwise apply to the woman as a result of her pregnancy ending, subject to assessment by the facility and a determination based on medical necessity related to substance use disorder and the impact of substance use disorder on birth outcomes.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to items and services furnished on or after January 1, 2019.

SEC. 3. GRANT PROGRAM TO EXPAND YOUTH ADDICTION TREATMENT FACILITIES UNDER MEDICAID AND CHIP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program under which the Secretary shall award grants to States for the purpose of expanding the infrastructure and treatment capabilities, including augmenting equipment and bed capacity, of eligible youth addiction treatment facilities that provide addiction treatment services to Medicaid or CHIP beneficiaries who have not attained the age of 21 and are in communities with high numbers of medically underserved populations of at-risk youth.

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds awarded under this section may be used to expand the infrastructure and treatment capabilities of an existing facility (including through construction) but shall not be used for the construction of any new facility or for the provision of medical assistance or child health assistance under Medicaid or CHIP.

(3) TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION; DURATION.—

(A) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall award grants under the grant program.

(B) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award grants under the grant program for a period not to exceed 5 years.

(b) APPLICATION.—A State seeking to participate in the grant program shall submit to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall require, an application that includes—

(1) detailed information on the types of additional infrastructure and treatment capacity of eligible youth addiction treatment facilities that the State proposes to fund under the grant program;

(2) a description of the communities in which the eligible youth addiction treatment facilities funded under the grant program operate;

(3) an assurance that the eligible youth addiction treatment facilities that the State proposes to fund under the grant program shall give priority to providing addiction treatment services to Medicaid or CHIP beneficiaries who have not attained the age of 21 and are in communities with high numbers of medically underserved populations of at-risk youth; and

(4) such additional information and assurances as the Secretary shall require.

(c) RURAL AREAS.—Not less than 15 percent of the amount of a grant awarded to a State under this section shall be used for making payments to eligible youth addiction treat-

ment facilities that are located in rural areas or that target the provision of addiction treatment services to Medicaid or CHIP beneficiaries who have not attained the age of 21 and reside in rural areas.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) ADDICTION TREATMENT SERVICES.—The term “addiction treatment services” means services provided to an individual for the purpose of treating a substance use disorder.

(2) CHIP.—The term “CHIP” means the State children’s health insurance program established under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.).

(3) ELIGIBLE YOUTH ADDICTION TREATMENT FACILITY.—The term “eligible youth addiction treatment facility” means a facility that is a participating provider under the State Medicaid or CHIP programs for purposes of providing medical assistance or child health assistance to Medicaid or CHIP beneficiaries for youth addiction treatment services on an inpatient or outpatient basis (or both).

(4) MEDICAID.—The term “Medicaid” means the medical assistance program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(5) MEDICAID OR CHIP BENEFICIARY.—The term “Medicaid or CHIP beneficiary” means an individual who is enrolled in the State Medicaid plan, the State child health plan under CHIP, or under a waiver of either such plan.

(6) MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.—The term “medically underserved populations” has the meaning given that term in section 330(b)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(b)(3)).

(7) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section. Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 167—RELATING TO THE RECOGNITION OF JERUSALEM AS THE CAPITAL OF ISRAEL AND THE RELOCATION OF THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY TO JERUSALEM

Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 167

Whereas each sovereign nation, under international law and custom, may designate its own capital;

Whereas, since 1950, the city of Jerusalem has been the capital of the State of Israel;

Whereas the city of Jerusalem is the seat of Israel’s President, Parliament, Supreme Court, and the site of numerous government ministries and social and cultural institutions;

Whereas the city of Jerusalem is the spiritual center of Judaism and is also considered a holy city by members of other religious faiths;

Whereas Jerusalem must remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected as they have been by Israel since 1967;