The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GALLAGHER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, Lord of us all, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You, O Lord, are the source of life and love. You hear the prayer of Congress, both for the good of this Nation and for the good of humanity around the world. Help this Congress and the President to discern Your will in our day.

By drawing upon the truth taken from a diversity of opinions, may a solid foundation be formed upon which a stable future may be built.

May short-term gains or self-interest never prove to be an obstacle to true vision. Rather, Lord, grant to each Member depth of perception, clear analysis, and creative response to the needs of our time.

In these days, give wisdom to all the Members, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.
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Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now.

DO YOUR JOB

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I don’t often make these 1-minute speeches, but I am concerned about where we might head next week in terms of the budget.

Last week, the House took another weeklong break instead of staying here in order to talk about fulfilling our fundamental duty of passing a budget and funding the government. Yet here we are once again, for the third time in 2 months, just 10 days away from government funding running out, and once again we are scheduled to leave town.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is paid to do a job, and so we shouldn’t leave town until that job is done. This constant cycle of careening from one budgetary deadline to the next is irresponsible and embarrassing. Only in Washington is doing nothing like keeping the lights on considered such a difficult achievement.

It doesn’t have to be this way. The solution is simple: No more breaks. Lock us on the House floor until we reach a budget agreement that does right by our constituents, does right by the military, does right by all these different programs.

Passing a budget is not just our job, it is the law, and no one, including this body, is above the law. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to end the partisan stall tactics. Let’s work together and do the job we were elected to do.

THE BLANK CHECK OF SECTION 702

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, since 2001, the civil liberties of the American people have been trammeled on under the blank check of section 702, a program that exists to allow our government to surveil foreigners on foreign soil, but which also allows our government to warrantless monitor the communications of everyday Americans without a warrant and with blatant disregard for our Fourth Amendment constitutional rights.

Now, we have a very important responsibility here in Congress to strike a balance between national security and keeping the American people safe while also protecting our constitutionally protected freedoms.

I urge my colleagues to vote for our bipartisan USA Rights amendment today to give the executive and departmental authorities to keep the American people safe while also, simultaneously, protecting our civil liberties.

Now, unfortunately, opponents of this USA Rights amendment are pushing fear tactics and misinformation. Don’t fall for it. Let us make this critical choice. Vote to keep our country safe. Vote to uphold our constitutional rights that so many have fought and died to protect.

RECOGNIZING TANIA PRATNICKI YOUNG

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent a large number of dedicated autoworkers who work in Michigan’s Seventh Congressional District. Today I want to recognize one of the truly exceptional ones, Tania Pratnicki Young, the plant manager at Dundee Engine Plant in Dundee, Michigan. Tania has been the plant manager since 2013 and recently reached a remarkable milestone: 40 years with the company.

The Fiat Chrysler plant employs about 700 people and produces engines for various Dodge and Jeep products, including the Jeep Cherokee. Under Tania’s leadership, Dundee was the first U.S. facility to be awarded silver status for implementing the principles of World Class Manufacturing. It shows her commitment to excellence in productivity, quality, and safety.

Tania calls Dundee “the family plant.” I have had the privilege of touring the factory floor with her and was impressed by the efficiency of the plant and the friendliness of her team. Thanks to people like Tania Pratnicki Young, the auto industry is thriving in Michigan.

Tania, congratulations on your 40-year anniversary.

HONORING DANA MARSHALL-BERNSTEIN

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

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today not only to mourn the loss of a family friend and lifelong Las Vegas resident, but to let Congress know what an amazing young woman she was.

Dana Marshall-Bernstein died in December at the age of 28 following a lifetime battle with Crohn’s disease. She spent most of her life in and out of the hospital, but even while she was undergoing countless surgeries, she never let her disease define her. She never stopped feeling optimistic about her future. She believed in kindness, and she used her experience to comfort others who were also affected by Crohn’s disease.

She shined in more ways than one, and I know she will continue to shine in the memory of each and every life she touched, and her memory will be a blessing to all those who knew and loved her.
I encourage all Members here today to carry with them the courage and determination that Dana brought into this world: to always think and live life with positivity and never ever stop believing in doing good by others.

NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a judge in Texas, I saw it all: rape, robbery, murder, kidnapping, child abuse. Now, in Congress, we are learning about the horrors of human trafficking, sex slavery.

Many groundbreaking laws have been passed to increase resources for victims and crack down on traffickers and buyers, but like all criminal enterprises, traffickers constantly stay ahead of the laws.

Fortunately for victims, there is an army of individuals, NGOs, religious and other advocacy groups fighting on behalf of victims. The people serving in these organizations are New Friends New Life, RAIN, Polaris, Rights4Girls, Shared Hope, Coalition Against Trafficking, and Demand Abolition, just to name a few. They have all dedicated their lives to serve and save victims of trafficking on the front lines.

On this National Human Trafficking Awareness Day, I want to thank all those warriors—the victims’ posse, as I call them—battling the injustice of human slavery. We will not give up this fight until this scourge has been eradicated.

And that is just the way it is.

☐ 0915

COMMENORATING KOREAN AMERICAN DAY

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate Korean American Day, which celebrates the arrival of the first 102 Korean immigrants to the United States on January 13, 1903.

The first Korean immigrants came in pursuit of the American Dream and initially served as farmworkers, wage laborers, and section hands. Through resilience, effort, and sacrifice, they established the foundation for their children and future generations. Today, nearly 2 million Korean Americans have honored their ancestors’ legacy and achieved the American Dream by transforming all aspects of American life: from Roy Choi, who joined Latino and Korean culture to create new cuisines that have won the stomachs of all Americans, to the first Korean American elected to Congress, Jay Kim; and to the countless Korean Americans who run successful small businesses.

I am honored to represent the largest Korean population in the country and to reintroduce this resolution on the 115th anniversary of the first Korean immigrant arrivals. I call upon my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the Korean Americans who helped strengthen and shape our country.

Rapid DNA Act of 2017

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 682, I call up the bill (S. 139) to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 682, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-53, shall be considered as added, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

S. 139

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017.”

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Amendments to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

TITIE I—ENHANCEMENTS TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION AND SAFEGUARDS, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND OVERSIGHT

Sec. 101. Querying procedures required.
Sec. 102. Use and disclosure provisions.
Sec. 103. Congressional review and oversight of backlogs.
Sec. 104. Publication of minimization procedures.
Sec. 105. Section 705 emergency provision.
Sec. 106. Compensation of amici curiae and technical experts.
Sec. 107. Additional reporting requirements.
Sec. 108. Improvements to Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.
Sec. 109. Privacy and civil liberties officers.
Sec. 110. Whistleblower protections for contractors of the intelligence community.
Sec. 111. Briefing on notification requirements.
Sec. 112. Inspector General report on queries conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

TITIE II—EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES, INCREASED PENALTIES, REPORTS, AND OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 201. Extension of title VII of FISA; effective dates.
Sec. 202. Increased penalty for unauthorized removal and retention of classified documents or material.
Sec. 203. Report on challenges to the effectiveness of foreign intelligence surveillance.
Sec. 204. Comprehensive general study on the classification system and protection of classified information.

Sec. 205. Technical amendments and amendments to improve procedures of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review.
Sec. 206. Severability.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision of this Act, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

SEC. 3. QUERYING PROCEDURES REQUIRED.

(a) QUERYING PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 702 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (f) through (l) as subsections (g) through (m), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

(2) PROCEDURES.—

(A) REQUIREMENT TO ADOPT.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall adopt procedures consistent with the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States for information collected pursuant to an authorization under subsection (a).

(B) RECORD OF UNITED STATES PERSON QUERY TERMS.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall ensure that the procedures adopted under subparagraph (A) include a technical procedure whereby a record is kept of each United States person query term used for a query.

(C) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The procedures adopted in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall be subject to judicial review pursuant to subsection (i).

(3) ACCESS TO RESULTS OF CERTAIN QUERIES CONDUCTED BY FBI.—

(A) COURT ORDER REQUIRED FOR FBI REVIEW OF CERTAIN QUERY RESULTS IN CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS UNRELATED TO NATIONAL SECURITY.—Except as provided by subparagraph (E), in connection with a predicated criminal investigation opened by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that does not relate to the national security of the United States, the Federal Bureau of Investigation may not access the contents of communications acquired under subsection (a) that were retrieved pursuant to using a United States person query term that was not designed to find and extract foreign intelligence information unless—

(i) the Federal Bureau of Investigation applies for an order of the Court under subparagraph (C); and

(ii) the Court enters an order under subparagraph (D) approving such application.

(B) JURISDICTION.—The Court shall have jurisdiction to review an application and to enter an order approving the access described in subparagraph (A).

(C) APPLICATION.—Each application for an order under this paragraph shall be made by a Federal officer in writing upon oath or affirmation to a judge having jurisdiction under subparagraph (B). Each application shall require the approval of the Attorney General based upon a finding of the judge that the application satisfies the criteria and requirements of such application, as set forth in this paragraph, and shall include—

(i) the identity of the Federal officer making the application; and

(ii) an affidavit or other information containing a statement of the facts and circumstances relied upon by the applicant to justify the belief of the applicant that the contents...
(A) in subsection (a)(7)(B)—
(i) by striking “targeting and minimization procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d) and (e)” and inserting “targeting, minimization, and querying procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)”;
(ii) by striking “subsection (i)(1)(C)” and inserting “subsection (i)(3)”,
(iii) by striking “subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)”;
(iv) by striking “subsection (i)” and inserting “subsection (j)”;
(v) by striking “targeting and minimization procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d) and (e)” and inserting “targeting, minimization, and querying procedures adopted in accordance with subsections (d), (e), and (f)(1)”;
(vi) by striking “subsection (j)” and inserting “subsection (k)”;
(vii) by striking “section 702(h)” and inserting “section 702(i)”;

(b) by striking “section 702(g)” each place it appears and inserting “section 702(h)”;
(c) in section 707(b)(1)(G)(ii), by striking “subsections (d), (e), (f)(1), and (g)”;
(3) AMENDMENTS TO FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008.—Section 404 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261; 50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended—
(A) in subsection (a)(7)(B)—
(i) by striking “under section 702(i)” and inserting “under section 702(j)”;
(ii) by striking “section 702(i)(4)” and inserting “section 702(i)(3)”;
(B) by striking “section 702(h)” and inserting “section 702(h)”;
(C) in subsection (f), by striking “subsection (a)”,
(D) by striking “section 702(m)”;

SEC. 102. USE AND DISCLOSURE PROVISIONS.

(a) END USE RESTRICTION.—Section 706(a) (50 U.S.C. 1881e(a)) is amended—

(b) by striking “information acquired” and inserting the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Information acquired; and
(2) by adding at the end the following:

(3) UNITED STATES PERSONS.—Any information concerning a United States person acquired under section 702 shall not be used in evidence against such United States person pursuant to paragraph (1) in any criminal proceeding unless

(4) the Federal Bureau of Investigation obtained an order of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to access such information pursuant to section 702(h); or

(ii) the Attorney General determines that—

(a) death;
(b) kidnapping;
(c) serious bodily injury, as defined in section 1365 of title 18, United States Code;
(d) torture;
(e) extraterritorial criminal offense that is a specified offense against a minor, as defined in section 111 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (34 U.S.C. 20911);

(‘‘ee’’) incapacitation or destruction of critical infrastructure, as defined in section 106(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 15653(e));

(i) cybersecurity, including conduct described in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 15653(e)) or section 1029, 1030, or 2511 of title 18, United States Code; and
d) transnational organized crime, including transnational narcotics trafficking and transnational organized crime or

(ii) human trafficking

(B) NO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A determination by the Attorney General under subparagraph (A)(ii) is not subject to judicial review.

(c) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DISCLOSURE PROVISION.—Section 603 (50 U.S.C. 1873) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—
(1) by striking “good faith estimate of the number of targets of such orders”;

(ii) the Attorney General determines that—

(i) the criminal proceeding involves

(B) the number of targets of such orders;

(ii) by adding “United States; or

(c) the criminal proceeding involves

(ii) by adding “the Attorney General determines that—

(2) AMENDMENTS TO FISA.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is further amended—

(A) by striking “section 702(h)” each place it appears and inserting “section 702(i)”;
“(C) the number of targets of such orders who are known to be United States persons;”;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting before clause (i) of paragraph (2) of section 702(c) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(c)(2)) the following:

“(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3)(A) and (3)(B) as paragraphs (3)(A) and (3)(C), respectively; and

(iii) by striking subsection (B), as so redesignated, the following:

“(A) the number of targets of such orders;

(iv) in subsection (C), by striking “subsection (B),” as so redesignated, by striking “and” and “at the end; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) in instances in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation opened, under the Criminal Investigative Division or any successor division, an investigation of a United States person who is not considered a threat to national security based wholly or in part on an acquisition authorized under such subsection;”;

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “orders;” and

(D) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(i) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except with respect to information acquired from an acquisition conducted under section 702 or subsection (d) of section 305 of the intent of the government to enter into evidence or otherwise use or disclose any information obtained or derived from electronic surveillance, physical search, or an acquisition conducted pursuant to this Act;” and

(ii) by redesigning subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(A) the number of targets of such orders who are known to be United States persons; and

(F) by inserting under section 702(h) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(2)(A)), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court pursuant to paragraph (1), by striking “(4), or (5),” and inserting “(5), or (6),”;

(G) by inserting under section 103(i)(2)(A) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(c)(2)), the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence shall notify the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the written notice.

(B) LIMITATION ON ACTION DURING CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or in the case of an acquisition pursuant to paragraph (1), unless the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence make a determination pursuant to section 702(c)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(c)(2)), the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence may not implement the authorization of such an acquisition, approving materials in accordance with this subsection.

(C) WRITTEN NOTICE.—Written notice under paragraph (2)(A) shall include the following:

(A) A copy of any certification submitted to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a), or amendment thereto, authorizing the intentional acquisition of abouts communications, including all affidavits, procedures, exhibits, and attachments submitted therewith.

(B) The decision, order, or opinion of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court approving such certification, and any pleadings, applications, or memoranda of law associated with such decision, order, or opinion.

(C) A summary of the protections in place to detect an material breach.

(D) Data or other results of modeling, simulation, or auditing of sample data demonstrating that any acquisition method involving the intentional acquisition of abouts communications shall be conducted in accordance with title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881 et seq.), if such data or other results exist at the time the written notice is submitted, or as provided to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

(E) Except as provided under paragraph (4), a statement that no acquisition authorized under section 702(c)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(c)(2)) with respect to the intentional acquisition of abouts communications has been conducted jointly by the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence shall notify the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives as soon as practicable, but not later than 7 days after the determination is made.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION OR CONTINUATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court makes a determination that authorizes the intentional acquisition of abouts communications before the end of the 30-day period described in paragraph (2)(B), the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence may authorize the immediate implementation or continuation of that certification if the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence determine that circumstances exist such that without such immediate implementation or continuation intelligence important to the national security of the United States may be lost or not timely acquired.

(ii) NOTICE.—The Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives notification of a determination pursuant to clause (i) as soon as practicable, but not later than 3 days after the determination is made.

(C) REPORTING OF MATERIAL BREACH.—Subsection (m) of section 702 (50 U.S.C. 1881a), as redesignated by section 101, is amended—

(A) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) REPORTING OF MATERIAL BREACH.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of each element of the intelligence community involved in the acquisition of abouts communications shall fully and currently inform the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the congressional intelligence committees of a material breach.

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) The term ‘abouts communication’ means a communication that contains a reference to, but is not to or from, a target of an acquisition authorized under subsection (a).

“(ii) The term ‘material breach’ means significant noncompliance with applicable law or an order of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court concerning any acquisition of abouts communications.”

(D) APPOINTMENT OF AMICI CURIAE BY FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—For purposes of section 103(c)(2)(A) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(c)(2)), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court shall treat the first certification under section 702(h) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1881a(h)) or amendment thereto that authorizes the intentional acquisition of abouts communications as representing a novel or significant interpretation of the law, unless the court determines otherwise.

SEC. 106. PUBLICATION OF MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES UNDER SECTION 702.

Section 702(e) (50 U.S.C. 1881a(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(a) PUBLICATION.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall—

(A) conduct a declassification review of any minimization procedures adopted or amended in accordance with paragraph (1); and

(B) consistent with such review, and not later than 180 days after conducting such review, make such minimization procedures publicly available to the greatest extent practicable, which may be in redacted form.

(B) EMERGENCY PROVISION.—

(c) EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION.—If the Attorney General authorized the emergency employment of electronic surveillance or a physical...
search pursuant to section 105 or 304, the Attorney General may authorize, for the effective period of the emergency authorization and subsequent order pursuant to section 105 or 304, without a court order or in any other case in which the acquisition pursuant to paragraph (1) is terminated and no order with respect to the target of the acquisition is issued under section 105 or 304, any amendment or evidence derived from such acquisition shall be handled in accordance with section 704(d)(4).

SEC. 106. COMPENSATION OF AMICUS CURIAE AND TECHNICAL EXPERTS.

Subsection (i) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(11) COMPENSATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a court established under subsection (a) or (b) may compensate an amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) for assistance provided under such paragraph as the court considers appropriate and at such rate as the court considers appropriate.".

SEC. 107. ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.—Section 107 (50 U.S.C. 1807) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 107. REPORT OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.—

"(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—In April of each year, the Attorney General shall transmit to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and to the congressional intelligence committees and to the Chairman of the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report setting forth with respect to the preceding calendar year—

"(1) the total number of applications made for orders and extensions of orders approving electronic surveillance under this title;

"(2) the total number of such orders and extensions either granted, modified, or denied;

"(3) the total number of subjects targeted by electronic surveillance conducted under an order or emergency authorization under this title, rounded to the nearest 500, starting with 0–499; and

"(b) MEETINGS.—Subsection (i) of such section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(i)) is amended—

"(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

"(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) APPOINTMENT OF STAFF.—In April of each year, the Attorney General shall make the report publically available, or, if the Attorney General determines that the report cannot be made publically available consistent with national security, the Attorney General may make publically available an unclassified summary of the report or a redacted version of the report.''

SEC. 108. IMPROVEMENTS TO PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF STAFF.—Subsection (j) of section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(j)) is amended—

"(1) by redesigning paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

"(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) APPOINTMENT IN ABSENCE OF CHAIRMAN.—

"If the position of chairman of the Board is vacant, during the term of service of any such member, the Board, at the direction of the unanimous vote of the serving members of the Board, may exercise the authority of the chairman under paragraph (1)."

(b) MEETINGS.—Section 1062(a) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(a)) is amended—

"(1) by striking "hold public" and inserting "shall hold public"; and

"(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "but may, notwithstanding section 552 of title 5, United States Code, meet or otherwise communicate in any manner to confer or deliberate in a manner that is closed to the public";

SEC. 109. PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OFFICERS.

Section 105 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(c)) is amended—

"(1) in subsection (b), by striking "and" and inserting a semicolon;

"(2) in subsection (c), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

"(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(6) a good faith estimate of the total number of such persons who were targeted by electronic surveillance under an order or emergency authorization issued under this title, rounded to the nearest 500, 1000, 2000, 5000, starting with 0–499, and using or sharing classified information without authorization; or

"(7) gross management, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

"(2) ACTIONS BY REQUEST.—A personnel action under paragraph (1) is prohibited even if the action is undertaken at the request of an office, agency, or another employee.

"(3) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to ensure that a personnel action described in paragraph (1) shall not be taken if the action is undertaken at the request of an office, agency, or another employee.

"(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

"(A) the number of United States persons described in subparagraph (A), the number of persons whose information acquired pursuant to such order was reviewed or accessed by a Federal intelligence entity, or agent, reported to the Board nearest band of 500, starting with 0–499; and

"(B) the number of United States persons described in subparagraph (B), the number of persons whose information acquired pursuant to such order was reviewed or accessed by a Federal intelligence entity, or agent, reported to the Board nearest band of 500, starting with 0–499; and

"(B) of the number of United States persons described in subparagraph (A), the number of persons whose information acquired pursuant to such order was reviewed or accessed by a Federal intelligence entity, or agent, reported to the Board nearest band of 500, starting with 0–499; and

"(2) USE OF INFORMATION.—If an application submitted to the Court pursuant to section 104 or 303 is denied, or in any other case in which the acquisition pursuant to paragraph (1) is terminated and no order with respect to the target of the acquisition is issued under section 105 or 304, any amendment or evidence derived from such acquisition shall be handled in accordance with section 704(d)(4).

SEC. 109. PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OFFICERS.

Section 1062(a) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(a)) is amended—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, subgrantee, or personal services contractor, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who has authority to take, direct others to take, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority, take or fail to take a personnel action with respect to any contractor employee as a reprisal for a lawful complaint by a contractor employee to the Director of National Intelligence (or an employee designated by the Director of National Intelligence for such purpose), the appropriate inspector general of a congressional intelligence community element or the head of the contracting agency (or an employee designated by the head of that agency for such purpose), the appropriate inspector general of the intelligence community, or a member of a congressional intelligence committee, which the contractor employee reasonably believes evidences—

"(A) a violation of any Federal law, rule, or regulation (including with respect to evidence of another employee or contractor employee accessing or sharing classified information without authorization); or

"(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

"(2) A personnel action under paragraph (1) is prohibited even if the action is undertaken at the request of an office, agency, or another employee.

"(3) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to ensure that a personnel action described in paragraph (1) shall not be taken if the action is undertaken at the request of an office, agency, or another employee.

"(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

"(A) the number of United States persons described in subparagraph (A), the number of persons whose information acquired pursuant to such order was reviewed or accessed by a Federal intelligence entity, or agent, reported to the Board nearest band of 500, starting with 0–499; and

"(B) the number of United States persons described in subparagraph (B), the number of persons whose information acquired pursuant to such order was reviewed or accessed by a Federal intelligence entity, or agent, reported to the Board nearest band of 500, starting with 0–499; and

"(5) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.

Section 105 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(c)) is amended—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, subgrantee, or personal services contractor, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who has authority to take, direct others to take, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority, take or fail to take a personnel action with respect to a contractor employee as a reprisal for a disclosure of information—

"(A) made to a supervisor in the direct line of command of the contractor employee;

"(B) to the Inspector General;

"(ii) to the Office of Professional Responsibility of the Department of Justice;

"(iii) to the Office of Professional Responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

"(iv) to the Inspector General of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or

"(v) to the Office of Special Counsel; or

"(vi) to an employee designated by any officer, employee, or division of the Office of Inspector General.

"(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

"(2) ACTIONS BY REQUEST.—A personnel action under paragraph (1) is prohibited even if the action is undertaken at the request of an official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, unless the request takes the form of a discretionary directive and is within the authority of the agency official making the request.

"(3) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to ensure that a personnel action described in paragraph (1) shall not be taken if the action is undertaken at the request of an office, agency, or another employee.

"(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:
(A) The term ‘contractor employee’ means an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, subgrantee, or personal services contractor, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(B) The term ‘obtaining or deriving’ means any action described in clauses (1) through (2) of section 2302(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, with respect to a contractor employee.

(c) PROVISION OF SECURITY CLEARANCES AND ACCESS AUTHORIZATIONS.—Section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) INCLUSION OF CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.—In this subsection, the term ‘employee’ includes an employee of a contractor, subcontractor, grantee, subgrantee, or personal services contractor, of an agency. With respect to such employee, the term ‘employing agency’ shall be deemed to be the contracting agency.”.

SEC. 111. BRIEFING ON NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall provide to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report on current and future challenges to the effectiveness of the foreign intelligence surveillance activities of the United States authorized under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

TITLED II—EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES, INCREASED PENALTIES, REPORTS, AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF TITLE VII OF FISA, EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 403(b) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110–261; 122 Stat. 2474) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2023”;

(B) by inserting “by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017” after “in section 201(a)”;

(2) in paragraph (2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2023”;

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 404(b) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110–261; 122 Stat. 2474), as amended by section 101, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2023”;

(B) by inserting “by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017” after “in section 101(a)”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017” after “in section 101(a)”;

(c) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form to the extent consistent with national security, but may include classified information.

SEC. 202. INCREASED PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED REMOVAL AND RETENTION OF CLASSIFIED DOCUMENTS OR MATERIAL.

Section 1924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “one year” and inserting “five years”.

SEC. 203. REPORT ON CHALLENGES TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report on current and future challenges to the effectiveness of the foreign intelligence surveillance activities of the United States authorized under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

(1) The report under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(A) The extraordinary and surging volume of data occurring worldwide;

(B) Changes to worldwide telecommunications patterns or infrastructure;

(C) Technical obstacles in determining the location of data or persons;

(D) The increasing complexity of the legal regime, including regarding requests for data in the custody of foreign governments;

(E) The current and future ability of the United States to obtain, on a compulsory or voluntary basis, assistance from telecommunication providers or others with respect to the United States, or could foreseeably challenge such activities during the decade following the date of the report, including with respect to—

(A) the type or volume of any United States personal identifiers identified under paragraphs (3) or (4) of section 702; and

(B) the type or volume of any United States personal identifiers identified under paragraphs (3) or (4) of section 702.

 SEC. 204. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON THE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the classification system of the United States and the methods by which the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4))) protects classified information.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study under subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) Whether sensitive information is properly classified;

(2) The effect of modern technology on the storage and protection of classified information, including with respect to—

(A) cloud computing in post-9/11 cybersecurity

(3) The practice of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to queries conducted under such section 702 for auditing purposes.

(4) The training or other processes of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to ensure compliance with such querying procedures.

(5) The implementation of such querying procedures with respect to queries conducted when evaluating an assignment or preclearance investigation relating to the national security of the United States.

(6) Whether each element of the intelligence community—

(A) follows uniform standards in determining who is authorized to access classified information; and
SEC. 205. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS AND AMENDMENTS TO IMPROVE PROCEDURES OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.

(a) Technical Amendment.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 103(b) (50 U.S.C. 1803(b)), by striking “designate as the” and inserting “designated as the”.

(2) In section 302(a)(1)(A)(ii) (50 U.S.C. 1823(a)(1)(A)(ii)), by striking “subparagraphs (A) through (D)”.

(3) In section 406(b) (50 U.S.C. 1846(b)), by striking “and to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate”.

(b) Court-Related Amendments.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended further as follows:

(1) In section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803)—

(A) by striking “The terms” and inserting “In this title,”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “designated as the” and inserting “designated as”.

(2) In section 105(d) (50 U.S.C. 1805(d)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.”.

(3) In section 302(d) (50 U.S.C. 1823(d)), by striking “immediately”.

(c) Form.—The report under subsection (c) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 206. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act, of any such amendments, and of the application of such provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Intelligence.

After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 115-504, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BOSAKO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, S. 139.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 139.

On January 19, the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 will expire. This vital legislation includes section 702, which permits the government to target foreign citizens located overseas to obtain foreign intelligence information. Section 702 is one of the most, if not the most, critical national security tool used by our intelligence community to obtain intelligence on foreign terrorists located overseas.

Now, some claim section 702 vacuums bulk information not related to the intended target. This assertion is false. Section 702 is a targeted program, with roughly 106,000 foreign targets worldwide. Given that the worldwide population is about 7.5 billion, this program can hardly be described as a bulk collection.

Section 702 targets spies, terrorists, weapons proliferators, and other foreign adversaries who threaten the United States, and locating them is crucial to protecting our troops and our homeland.

As an example, Hajji Iman, who was the second-in-command of ISIS, was located via section 702 and later removed from the battlefield. While the vast majority of examples remain classified, this is just one instance that demonstrates the necessity of this authority.

This order requirement does not reflect the committee’s belief or intent that law enforcement access to lawfully acquired information constitutes a separate search under the Fourth Amendment. The Fourth Amendment, as interpreted by numerous Federal courts, does not require the FBI to obtain a separate order from the FISC to review lawfully acquired 702 information.

The order requirement does not reflect the committee’s belief or intent that law enforcement access to lawfully acquired information constitutes a separate search under the Fourth Amendment. The Fourth Amendment, as interpreted by numerous Federal courts, does not require the FBI to obtain a separate order from the FISC to review lawfully acquired 702 information.

SEC. 207. FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.

(a) Court-Related Amendments.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is further amended as follows:

(1) In section 103(b) (50 U.S.C. 1803(b)), by striking “terms” and inserting “terms, and a classified annex.

(2) In section 104(a) (50 U.S.C. 1804(a)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(b) Court-Related Amendments.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is further amended as follows:

(1) In section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803)—

(A) by striking “terms” and inserting “all terms”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “designated as the” and inserting “designated as”;

(ii) by striking “and to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate”.

(2) In section 105(d) (50 U.S.C. 1805(d)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.”.

(3) In section 302(d) (50 U.S.C. 1823(d)), by striking “immediately”.

(4) In section 402(d) (50 U.S.C. 1842(d)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.”.

(5) In section 403(c) (50 U.S.C. 1843(c)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.”.

(6) In section 404(b) (50 U.S.C. 1844(b)), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.”.

The bill’s reforms include:

· Requiring specific section 702 query procedures, separate from existing minimization procedures, which must be reviewed by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court every year;

· Limiting the instances in which the government can use section 702 information to prosecute United States citizens;

· Requiring the inspector general of the Department of Justice to conduct a review of the FBI’s interpretation and implementation of the FBI’s section 702 query procedures temporarily codifying the end of the NSA’s section 702 upstream “abouts” collection until the government develops new procedures and briefs the congressional Intelligence and Judiciary Committees;

· And, finally, improving transparency by mandating the publication of section 702 minimization procedures and requiring additional reporting to Congress on how the intelligence community is using other authorities.

Mr. Speaker, during discussions over the past several months, both the House and the Senate have made several concessions to achieve this compromised language in order to reauthorize this critical national security authority. Accordingly, S. 139 now includes a probable cause-based order requirement for the FBI to access the content of a section 702 communication during FBI criminal investigations on Americans, unrelated to national security.

This order requirement does not reflect the committee’s belief or intent that law enforcement access to lawfully acquired information constitutes a separate search under the Fourth Amendment. The Fourth Amendment, as interpreted by numerous Federal courts, does not require the FBI to obtain a separate order from the FISC to review lawfully acquired 702 information.

Though not required by the Constitution, this compromise is meant to provide additional protections for U.S.
person information that is incidentally collected under section 702. Along with the restrictions on the use of section 702 information in criminal prosecutions, this should provide further assurances to the American public that this vital national security tool is used strictly to protect foreign threats to the United States, and the handling and use of any incidental U.S. person information is carefully controlled and monitored.

Mr. Speaker, America faces an array of information threats more complicated than anything we have endured in the past.

[930]

Speaking for the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, I cannot emphasize enough that now is not the time to draw back on key national security authorities.

I am dismayed by the amount of disinformation being propagated by those who oppose section 702 for purely ideological reasons. When Congress must reauthorize this program again in 2023, we hope those who debate these issues, both inside and outside this Chamber, do so with intellectual honesty and integrity.

The USA RIGHTS Act, which has been offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute, is an attempt to kill this compromise. In its place, the amendment would begin resurrecting the information-sharing walls between national security and law enforcement that the 9/11 Commission identified as a major factor in the failure to identify and thwart the 9/11 plot.

If individuals in this body cannot learn from history, they are doomed to repeat it. There is no support for this bill in the majority of the committees of jurisdiction whose members understand that this amendment would render section 702 inoperable.

Therefore, in order to keep the U.S. interests and troops abroad safe from harm, we must ensure that the intelligence community has the tools it needs to provide intelligence to our soldiers abroad. Section 702 is critical in that regard, and S. 139 provides the intelligence community with the authorities needed to protect the homeland while implementing key privacy enhancements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of S. 139, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as HPSCI’s ranking member and a former member of the Judiciary Committee, I have long advocated for reforms to surveillance authorities to balance the imperatives of national security and counterterrorism with the privacy rights and civil liberties of Americans.

Today, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act seeks to reauthorize the program while making changes to protect privacy interests. Nonetheless, and I indicated before we took up the bill, in light of the significant concerns that have been raised by members of our Caucus, and in light of the irresponsible and inherently contradictory messages coming out of the White House today, I would recommend that we withdraw consideration of the bill today to give us more time to address the issues that have been raised as well as to get a clear statement from the administration about their position on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do this reluctantly. Section 702, I think, is among the most important programs in our surveillance programs. Nonetheless, I think that the issues that have been raised will need more time to be resolved, and I think we need to get a clear statement from the administration of whether they are in support of this legislation or they are not.

This morning, as my colleagues are aware, the President issued a statement via Twitter suggesting that this authority was used illegally by the Obama administration to surveil him. Of course, that is blatantly untrue but, nonetheless, casts an additional cloud over the debate today.

In light of these circumstances, I think the better course would be for us to defer consideration, give us more time to address the issues that have been raised by the privacy community within my own Caucus, but also within the administration about its inaccurate, conflicting, and confusing statements on the morning of debate.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly urge my colleagues to postpone consideration so that we can take up this bill when it is more ripe for consideration.

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Utah. While I am not a representative of my colleague from California’s comments, I do think we are at a place where we do need to move forward. If we succumb to the emotions of what is going on around us and don’t stick to the facts, stick to what we are trying to get done, I think that we do that to our detriment. So I have great respect for my colleague and his opinions, but I personally believe that plays into the emotions of what is going on rather than the facts of what is going on. If we can’t believe we should just continue to push forward.

First, let me say that the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act is a bipartisan compromise bill that preserves the operational flexibility of section 702 while instituting key reforms to further protect U.S. personal privacy.

One of the major issues discussed over the past year has been NSA’s “abouts communication” collection—a type of collection that is inherently inconsistent with the Fourth Amendment.

Rather than ending “abouts communication” collection, S. 139 strikes a right balance. If NSA wants to reestablish “abouts communication” collection, NSA would first need to go back to court, convince the judge that it has satisfied the court’s concerns. After achieving judicial approval that NSA has made the necessary technical changes, NSA would then brief congressional Intelligence and Judiciary Committees on how they plan to reestablish this type of collection.

If NSA can then start “abouts communication” collection, 30 days after those briefings.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I would reluctantly urge that we withdraw consideration of the bill for today. I certainly have been working as hard, I
think, as anyone to try to agree to a compromise that would move forward this very important surveillance authority but would strike the right balance between our security interests and our privacy interests, but I do think we need more time to be able to discuss this bill. And I think that it was only underscored this morning with the contradictory statements coming out of the administration.

An issue of this magnitude and this seriousness really deserves serious and sober discussion. I think we need more time to discuss this with our Members, and I would urge my colleagues not to bring this to a vote today to give us more time to work on it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues believe that Congress should go beyond what is required by the Fourth Amendment and institute additional safeguards on how the government handles any potential U.S. personal information that may be incidentally collected under section 702. While the advocates may have different ideas as to how to strike the right balance between additional privacy measures and national security, the art of the compromise brings us to the current junction.

Unfortunately, at 2 PM today if the bill conducts a U.S.-person query into its database during a criminal investigation not related to national security and conducts a section 702 communication, the FBI must obtain an order from the FISA court prior to assessing the content of the communication.

The committee does not believe that such an order is necessary under the Fourth Amendment, but it is adding more protections, as a matter of policy, in order to address unfounded concerns by opponents of section 702 that the authority is being used to investigate U.S. people.

Proponents of the USA RIGHTS Act amendment will say that S. 139 does not go far enough in its current form and that they have crafted a great compromise that allows the intelligence community to do its job.

Unfortunately, they are selling a poison pill that is extraordinarily harmful to our country. Per the director of the National Intelligence Community, under the USA RIGHTS Act amendment, the FBI would not be able to look at lawfully collected data related to suspicious activities similar to that of the 9/11 hijackers. This is unethical to the 9/11 Commission Report, and anyone who thinks about voting for the USA RIGHTS Act amendment should pick up a copy and skim it prior to voting.

Under the USA RIGHTS Act amendment, S. 139 is able to balance national security and privacy while adhering to the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission reporting. I echo the White House statement last night strongly opposing the USA RIGHTS Act amendment, and I urge all of my colleagues in the House to support S. 139.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 139, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act. As a former United States attorney, I know firsthand the enormous value that programs like section 702 provide in protecting our country.

The worst threats have been thwarted due to our intelligence and law enforcement communities having tools like section 702. Chairman GOODLATTE, along with the members of the Judiciary Committee, worked diligently on legislation to implement meaningful reforms while ensuring the law enforcement and Intelligence Committee still had the necessary tools available. This bill includes many other reforms from the USA Liberty Act, enhances section 702 protections, and maintains law enforcement abilities.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all Members to join me in voting ‘yes’ on this legislation to implement real reforms, while ensuring that we still provide the tools necessary to keep American citizens safe.

In conclusion, as a U.S. attorney, I have had the privilege of my office used this section. We follow the law to the letter. There were no complaints, and I want the American people to realize something: we in law enforcement, law enforcement throughout the U.S., we have to be right and on spot every second of every day. It only takes a terrorist a moment to get lucky and set off a bomb killing Americans.

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

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

I rise in strong opposition to the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017, which reauthorizes section 702 of FISA for 6 years without enacting adequate protections for our privacy.

Supporters of this measure want to convince us a new, incredibly narrow warrant provision actually constitutes reform. It does not. Our right to privacy does not begin when the Department of Justice has a fully formed criminal case against us, nor does it begin when prosecutors enter our emails and phone messages into evidence against us in court.

The Constitution guarantees far more than this. Our right to privacy protects us when the government first makes its decision to search our private communications for information it might find useful, and S. 139 falls well short of this basic guarantee. We, therefore, cannot—we must not—support this bill.

Make no mistake: S. 139 is not a compromise. The Judiciary Committee, the technology companies, civil society, and other critical stakeholders were shut out of this conversation long ago. S. 139 does not include a meaningful warrant requirement. This bill does not apply to any information that “could mitigate a threat,” an exception that threatens to swallow the rule. As a result, S. 139 allows the FBI unfettered access to this information for purely domestic nonterrorism cases without a warrant.

What does that mean in the year of Jeff Sessions and Donald Trump? It means that absolutely nothing stops the Department of Justice from trolling the database for evidence that you use marijuana or failed to pay your taxes or may be in the country unlawfully or possess a firearm that you should not have. None of these cases have anything to do with the core purposes of section 702, and all of them should require a warrant based on individualized suspicion and probable cause.

I agree with Chairman GOODLATTE that S. 139 should be reauthorized. I understand its importance to the intelligence agencies. But none of us should support this bill which pretends at reform while codifying some of the worst practices of the intelligence community in domestic crimes.

When we came to Congress, each of us took an oath to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States. I ask that each of my colleagues honor that oath today and that we work together to defeat this bill and bring the right set of reforms to the floor without delay.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am a former prosecutor and a former judge. I despise terrorists. We ought to go after them and get them. Section 702 was written to go after terrorists, but it is being used to go after Americans.

Normally, when I was a judge, I would sign a warrant. Before the government could go into your house, they had to have a warrant to go into the house and to seize something based on probable cause.

Under FISA, as it is used against Americans—forget the terrorists—as it is used against Americans, government has already seized your house of communications, all of it. They look around and sometimes—sometimes—they go back to a secret judge in a secret court and get a secret warrant by a FISA judge, and they come in and seize something and prosecute based on something irrelevant about terrorism. That is why this bill violates the Fourth Amendment.

Get a warrant before you go into the house of communications and effects
and papers of Americans or stay out of that house. These documents have been seized. Communications have been seized by government. They are kept forever.

Keep government out. Without a warrant, you stay out, because government is on you. If you cannot find it, the British cannot be trusted.

Get a warrant. Stay out of the house of communications.

Vote against this bill. Let's redraft it and protect Americans.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, like the ranking member, I oppose this bill. It does not meet the standards that we should have for adhering to the Constitution.

Now, this is a confusing debate in some ways because what is it we are talking about?

We are all against terrorism, and we have authorized the collection of data of terrorists communicating with each other. In section 702, if they communicate with somebody here, we can collect that, too.

But unlike the architecture of the internet, we are collecting vast amounts—we can't go into the numbers here in open session—vast amounts of data. It is not metadata; it is content. It is the content of your phone calls, content of your emails, and the content of your text messages and video messages. Under section 702, you can search access section 702-collected communications on U.S. persons in criminal investigations.

Moreover, in routine criminal cases, when the FBI accesses U.S. person communications incidentally collected without first obtaining a warrant, the FBI will not be permitted to use those communications in a criminal prosecution. This will prevent a national security tool from advancing run-of-the-mill prosecutions.

These are meaningful reforms. The bill that was presented to us before Christmas with its optional warrant construct was not real reform. The bill we are debating today, however, contains meaningful reform. I would have preferred to include additional reforms, but I cannot stress to my colleagues enough that our choice cannot be between a perfect reform bill and expiration of this program. The 702 program is far too important for that. With this bill, we can have meaningful reform and reauthorization. In its current form, this bill will pass the Senate.

I also want to caution everyone that we cannot go too far in seeking to alter this program. There is an amendment that will be offered sponsored by Mr. AMASH and Ms. LOFGREN that would prevent the FBI from ever querying its 702 database using a U.S. person term.

Imagine the FBI getting a tip from a flight instructor whose student acts suspiciously by expressing great interest in learning how to take off and fly a plane but has no interest in learning how to land the plane. This could be innocent behavior. It could be a foreign adversary, but it has emboldened the FBI to at least be able to perform a search to see if they already have, in their possession, any communications between the student and a foreign actor involved in organizing terrorist plots.

The Judiciary Committee-passed bill would have allowed the search and allowed law enforcement to view the metadata without a warrant while requiring a warrant to view the content of the communications.

The Amash-Lofgren amendment, which was rejected in the Judiciary Committee, goes too far and would prevent such a search from even being done. It would, thus, kill this critical program by preventing the FBI from even looking at its own databases without a warrant, rendering it ineffective in preventing terrorist attacks and stifling its ability to gather necessary intelligence. It must go.

I will vote to support this bill. I will oppose the Amash-Lofgren amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me. Vote for reform and reauthorization.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us are opposing this bill and supporting the amendment because it is very different from the Judiciary Committee bill that we reported, which was a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Supporters of this bill have called it reform. This is not reform. It is a massive expansion of the government's ability to pry into the private lives of innocent people. If anyone needs proof, just look at the bill's section 702 which is supposed to authorize spying on foreign adversaries, but it has emboldened some in law enforcement to collect and read private communications of American citizens without a warrant.

Instead of curbing these practices, S. 139 would codify and expand some of the most abusive of surveillance practices used in recent years, including "abouts" collection and backdoor searches.

There is no more important responsibility that we have than keeping the American people safe, but we have to do it in a way that is consistent with our laws and our Constitution. This bill undermines our values of privacy and freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures.

I urge my colleagues to oppose S. 139 and to support the Amash-Lofgren amendment, which would let intelligence agencies to do their jobs without undermining our values as Americans. We can do both things. Mr. Speaker: keep the American people safe and honor and respect our Constitution, which protects the privacy of all American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of this bill and support of the amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership in ensuring that a number of important reforms to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act were included in this legislation.

I rise in support of this modified version of S. 139. While this does not go as far to reform FISA section 702 as the USA Liberty Act, it must not be adopted out of the Judiciary Committee. As a member with my support, the reforms that are included help to provide a more appropriate balance between protecting our
civil liberties and providing the intelligence community an important national security tool for another 6 years before its expiration this Friday.

FISA section 702 is a critical tool used by the intelligence community to protect American citizens from foreign threats and has been used numerous times to prevent terrorist plots. Since we last reauthorized FISA section 702, much has changed not only in who our foreign threats are, but also in the methods that they use against us. The 2017 USA Freedom Act moved to protect the safety of the American people. We need to make sure constitutional protections are in place, and this is the proper balance.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat the refrain of those of us who are members of the Judiciary Committee who have gone through this process since 9/11, and that is that we support the integrity and the importance of section 702 as a national security tool, and we want it reauthorized, but we want it right.

Our job and our task is also to be the protectors of the Fourth Amendment, and that is the protection of the American people against unreasonable search and seizure.

No matter how much my friends on the other side of the aisle argue, we know that the USA Freedom Act can have the tools that it needs; but, in the instance of this underlying bill, similar to the bill that was passed in 2007 by the Bush administration, on which the Judiciary Committee came back and amended it and made it a bill that provides the tools that were needed by those who are on the front lines in the United States military and the FBI, ultimately, it was changed to deny those rights.

In this instance, the warrant that my friends are talking about is revised only to fully predicated cases. It does not apply to the searching of documents that will have information about Americans. I ask my colleagues to postpone this. Let us work together on behalf of the American people. Who are we if we cannot uphold the Constitution? It is not protected in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I rise in strong opposition to S. 139, the USA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017.

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

Section 702 authorizes the Justice Department and NSA to collect non-U.S. persons' communications that are sent while abroad.

The collection programs have to be approved each year by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISA Court).

The FISA Court was set up by the 1978 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA; Public Law 95–511) to oversee intelligence-gathering activities and ensure compliance with the U.S. Constitution.

Under FISA, the term “U.S. person” covers citizens, green card holders, associations with a substantial number of members who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents, and U.S.-incorporated companies.

Title VII also allows intelligence agencies to conduct surveillance on a specific U.S. person reasonably believed to be outside of the country, with the approval of the FISA Court.

The NSA's use of section 702 authority to collect Americans' information from their communications with foreign surveillance targets was revealed by former government contractor Edward Snowden in 2013. Snowden also revealed that the NSA obtains communications from U.S.-based providers such as Google, Verizon, and Facebook.

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

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

1. S. 139 fails to address the core concerns of Members of Congress and the American public about the government's use of Section 706 information against United States citizens investigations that have nothing to do with national security.

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

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

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

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

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

The USA Liberty Act enjoys much broader support, contains meaningful reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and is far superior to the bill we are debating today.

Inexplicably, the House Republican leadership did choose the best option, which was to bring the USA Liberty Act to the floor for debate and vote; instead, they chose the worst option, which is S. 139, the bill before us.

For this reason, I urge all members to join me in supporting the Amash-Lofgren Amendment, the best option remaining before us.

The Amash-Lofgren strike the text of S. 139 in its entirety and substitutes in its place the text of the "Uniting and Strengthening America by Reforming and Improving the Government's High-Tech Surveillance Act" ("USA RIGHTS Act").

In contrast to S. 139, the "USA RIGHTS Act" enacts necessary and meaningful reforms to Section 702, which are necessary in light of the past abuses of surveillance authorities, contemporary noncompliance with this authority, and the danger posed by potential future abuses.

First, the USA RIGHTS Act creates a search warrant requirement that closes the so-called "backdoor search loophole" through which the government searches, without first obtaining a court-issued warrant based on probable cause, for information about U.S. persons or persons inside the U.S.

Second, the "USA Rights Act" prohibits the collection of domestic communications and permanently ends "about" collection, an illegal practice the National Security Agency recently stopped because of persistent and significant compliance violations.

This is important because while "reverse targeting" is prohibited under the Jackson Lee Amendment, the worst option remaining before us, the "USA Rights Act" would close the so-called "backdoor search loophole" through which the government searches, without first obtaining a court-issued warrant based on probable cause, for information about U.S. persons or persons inside the U.S.

Third, the "USA Rights Act" requires the government give notice when it uses information obtained or derived from Section 702 surveillance in proceedings against U.S. persons or people on U.S. soil which will enable a defendant to assert his or her constitutional rights and help ensure that foreign intelligence surveillance is not being used for domestic law enforcement purposes.

Fourth, under the "USA Rights Act", Section 702 authority sunsets in 4 years, which will obligate the Congress to exercise regular oversight and provide the opportunity to make necessary reforms before reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, Section 712 in the USA Freedom Act enacted on June 2, 2016 (Pub. L. 114–23), this prohibition was often skirted by collecting information from communications that merely mention an intelligence target.

Under the "USA Rights Act", collections would be limited to communications that are "to" or "from" a target, and the intentional collection of wholly domestic communications is prohibited.

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

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

1. S. 139 fails to address the core concerns of Members of Congress and the American public about the government's use of Section 706 information against United States citizens investigations that have nothing to do with national security.

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

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

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

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

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

The USA Liberty Act enjoys much broader support, contains meaningful reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and is far superior to the bill we are debating today.

Inexplicably, the House Republican leadership did choose the best option, which was to bring the USA Liberty Act to the floor for debate and vote; instead, they chose the worst option, which is S. 139, the bill before us.

For this reason, I urge all members to join me in supporting the Amash-Lofgren Amendment, the best option remaining before us.

The Amash-Lofgren strike the text of S. 139 in its entirety and substitutes in its place the text of the "Uniting and Strengthening America by Reforming and Improving the Government's High-Tech Surveillance Act" ("USA RIGHTS Act").

In contrast to S. 139, the "USA RIGHTS Act" enacts necessary and meaningful reforms to Section 702, which are necessary in light of the past abuses of surveillance authorities, contemporary noncompliance with this authority, and the danger posed by potential future abuses.

First, the USA RIGHTS Act creates a search warrant requirement that closes the so-called "backdoor search loophole" through which the government searches, without first obtaining a court-issued warrant based on probable cause, for information about U.S. persons or persons inside the U.S.

Second, the "USA RIGHTS Act" prohibits the collection of domestic communications and permanently ends "about" collection, an illegal practice the National Security Agency recently stopped because of persistent and significant compliance violations.

This is important because while "reverse targeting" is prohibited under the Jackson Lee Amendment, the worst option remaining before us, the "USA Rights Act" would close the so-called "backdoor search loophole" through which the government searches, without first obtaining a court-issued warrant based on probable cause, for information about U.S. persons or persons inside the U.S.

Third, the "USA Rights Act" requires the government give notice when it uses information obtained or derived from Section 702 surveillance in proceedings against U.S. persons or people on U.S. soil which will enable a defendant to assert his or her constitutional rights and help ensure that foreign intelligence surveillance is not being used for domestic law enforcement purposes.

Fourth, under the "USA Rights Act", Section 702 authority sunsets in 4 years, which will obligate the Congress to exercise regular oversight and provide the opportunity to make necessary reforms before reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, Section 712 in the USA Freedom Intelligence Surveillance Act was enacted to protect the liberty and security of Americans, not to diminish their constitutional rights.

All Americans want to find the common ground where consensus rules and regulations relating to fighting terrorism at home and abroad can exist while still protecting the cherished privacy and civil liberties which Americans hold close to our collective hearts.

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

One way to do that without interfering with the national security objectives of 702 surveillance is simply to reauthorize S. 139 and support the USA RIGHTS Act by voting for the Amash-Lofgren Amendment.

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

And the best way to keep America safe and strong is to remain true to the valued embedded in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.
S. 139 does not strike the proper balance between our cherished liberties and smart security.

We can do better; we should reject S. 139 and support the Amash-Lofgren Amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRNNER), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. SENSENBRNNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I will speak later on some of the other parts.

I want to talk about the “abouts” stuff that is reauthorized in this bill after the NSA itself stopped doing it earlier last year.

What “abouts” collection means is that, for example, if you have two jihadists that are in Pakistan and are communicating with each other that they didn’t like something that Mr. NADLER said against jihadists, the FBI can pick up the phone name “Nadler” and go into all of his emails, all of his texts, all of the information that they have on him and be able to see what Mr. NADLER had said about jihadists and much, much more. That is why this bill opens the door to something that the NSA has closed itself.

We will hear from people who support “abouts” collection that Congress has got a chance to review it. They give us 30 days to do it. We can’t get anything done in 30 days. Vote “no” on the bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, having served on Active Duty in the United States military, it comes to foreign terrorists on foreign soil, we need to track them down and kill them. That is why I support the FISA Act as applied to foreigners. But guess what. The information does not come with little labels attached saying: this is a United States citizen communicating here, or the communication involves someone in the United States.

Therefore, it is absolutely vitally important that we not impair the most important electronic intelligence-gathering mechanism that the United States has to keep us safe. Oppose the Amash amendment.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill that does nothing to stop the unconstitutional collection of Americans’ international communications without first obtaining a warrant, and it codifies the practice of indiscriminately sweeping up massive amounts of domestic communications.

What makes us different from those who would harm us is our commitment to our constitutional values: that we are innocent until proven guilty and that our government must obtain a warrant and show probable cause that there is a legitimate reason to listen in on our conversations.

This bill will further expose people to warrantless prosecutions or detention and deportation in cases that have absolutely no connection whatsoever to national security.

I hope we reject this bill, unless we approve the Amash-Lofgren amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have only one speaker remaining to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the House of Representatives for coming together on the floor of the House and in our various caucuses and conferences to discuss the important challenge that we all face: the balance that we have to protect the American people. That is the oath we take: to protect and defend. As we defend the Constitution, we defend the privacy and the civil liberties of the American people.

It is difficult.

Over 20 years ago, I was on the Intelligence Committee for the purpose of protecting civil liberties and privacy, and also to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, two really important overarching issues. So I come to the floor today as one who has worked on this issue for a very long time.

I thank our men and women in the intelligence community for the work they do. We are so proud of what they do.

In those days, almost 25 years ago, when I was first on the committee, it was about force protection and trying to have enough intelligence to avoid conflict, but if we were to engage, we would have the intelligence to protect our forces. It was about force protection. In the nineties, it became more about fighting terrorism and other overarching issues as well.

We live in a dangerous world and force protection on the ground, in the air, is still an essential part of what the intelligence community does.

Again, I thank the men and women in the intelligence community for their patriotism and their courage.

The issue that relates to fighting terrorism is one that sometimes has a frightening manifestation on our own soil. But as we protect the American people and the Constitution and their rights, we have to have that balance. It was Benjamin Franklin who said: If we don’t fight for security and freedom, we won’t have either.

I want to particularly thank our ranking member on the Intelligence Committee. He has made us all proud in going across the country to honor our Constitution, talking about undermining our election system, talking about protecting the American people in ways that is consistent with our Constitution. I thank Mr. SCHIFF and I support him today in his support of the bill that came from his committee.
Is it perfect?
I have never voted for a perfect bill in this House.
I also thank Mr. NADLER, a genius on all of these issues that relate to our Constitution. I also thank the members of the Judiciary Committee.
We have very few members on the Intelligence Committee who are depu-
tized by the Speaker and by the leaders of
each party to go to the Intelligence Committee to deal with issues that relate
to the balance between security and privacy.
With all the respect in the world for the
magnificent members of the Judiciary
Committee, all of whom I respect, it
is not right to say there is nothing in this
bill that protects the privacy of the American people.
In fact, when I was supporting the Judiciary Committee bill, outside groups were complaining. They wanted the Zoe Lofgren amendment. They didn't want that bill. They were com-
plaining about today. They are saying that is what they want.
Studying the issue, I think one of the
differences along the way is when it is
appropriate in terms of a warrant.
That is why I am so pleased that we will
vote today some outside groups that
addresses just that concern, which is
what I am hearing about from folks.
The amendment, the motion to re-
commit, addresses concerns of people
on both sides of the aisle, certainly in
our Democratic Caucus, that seeks to
secure the highest possible protections
for American civil liberties. At the
same time, it ensures that the intel-
ligence community and law enforce-
ment can continue to keep Americans
safe.
This amendment would go a step fur-
ther from the modified bill that is on
the floor under consideration to ensure law enforcement secures a warrant be-
fore accessing Americans' information.
Let me repeat that. The amendment
will go a step further than the modified
bill under consideration to ensure law enforcement secures a warrant before accessing Americans' information.
Under this amendment, a court order
would be required to access Americans' data in connection with any
non-
national security criminal investiga-
tion by the FBI.
This amendment removes predicate—
that is the operational word—stand-
ards that expands the universe of in-
vestigations that would require a war-
rant.
A vote for this amendment—and I
hope it would be bipartisan, especially
from those who are objecting to the
bill on the floor—is a vote for privacy
protection and for civil liberties. We
would have preferred to have this in
the original bill that is coming to the
floor. We couldn't get that in com-
mittee. Hopefully, we can get it on the
floor.
Voting against the motion to recom-
mit means fewer protections, less over-
sight, and more risk that Americans' rights will be violated.
In the course of this, I mentioned
this issue about the warrant and ar-
rest. I talked about the Judiciary Com-
mittee's bill. At the offset of all of this,
we all opposed the first Intelligence
Committee's bill. We supported the Ju-
diciary Committee's bipartisan bill
being held in the Judiciary Committee
for supporting it, rather than the Lof-
gren amendment.
But changes were made in the Inte-
ligence Committee's bill to this effect.
We asked the Speaker to take out the
bashing of the bill, but he wouldn't do
it. We have no place in this bill. The chairman of the
Intelligence Committee, Mr. NUNES,
foolishly put that in this bill. It made it
a complete nonstarter. I thank the
Speaker for removing it.
By the way, somebody should tell the
President because he thinks it is still
in the bill. With that being said, I per-
sonally directed the unmasking process
be fixed. It isn't fixed in the bill. Mr. President. That would be a second
warrant. That would be a second
twist of the day, confusing matters
even worse, unfortunately. The admin-
istration, although they probably
would like an extension of the status quo,
understands we have to do more than that.
Then, on the ‘abouts’ language, I
think most people who understand
that—it is a complicated issue—under-
stand that it is really not a factor in
this discussion. People don't want it
mentioned, but the fact is that it had
to be addressed. It is not being used
and it is unconstitutional. Until it can
be proven to be constitutional, it can’t
be used. When it is used, they would
have to go to the FISA court to get
permission, and then come to Congress
for ratification. So there are many
protections there.
It is hard, I know. I had a hard time
when I was Speaker and we passed a
bill to address the gross violations of
Vice President Cheney doing the Bush-
Cheney surveillance. It was appalling,
in my view. I considered it unconstitu-
tional, others did not. But, nonethe-
less, we put in many, many protections
where there were none, and then re-
newed and improved them when we re-
newed the bill subsequently in its reau-
 thorization.
This isn't about the other side of the
aisle that is saying you don't care
about privacy if you support this bill.
It isn't about that. It is about where
you strike the balance when you weigh
the equities.
We have to come down in favor of
honoring our Constitution and our civil
liberties, but we cannot do that com-
pletely at the expense. And I believe
that the Members and Mr. NADLER un-
derstand that full well, and I commend
him for his deep understanding of the
vital national security issues and the
invaluable work that his committee has
done to strike a balance between
security and privacy and has made a
difference.
But the choice we have today is to
pick something that is—defeat this
bill. Okay. You have done that, if you
want to do that. Pass an amendment
that won't go anywhere, you can do
that, and we will be left with extension
of the status quo of the current law.
And that is why I am so glad it has
been expanded by the Speaker who has
written it those years ago. I understand its
merit. I also understand the changes in
technology, of tactics of terrorists who
are out there, and that we have to
improve the bill.
I don't consider it a reform bill. It is
not that vast. It is some improvements
in how we can collect, protect, again,
keep the American people safe as well
as protect their civil liberties for a
lot of people. It is not that.
Since this legislation was designed to
address concerns related to the use of
information collected under FISA sec-
tion 702, an important foreign intel-
ligence collection authority—we have
to keep that emphasis on “an impor-
tant foreign intelligence authority.”
So, my colleagues, to that end, this
modifies that it requires a court order
based on probable cause for FBI crim-
inal investigators to view Americans’
communication in the section 702 data-
bases that mandates an inspector gen-
eral study of 702 data. So let's keep the
vigilance on, even as we go forward. It
contains refined language related to
“abouts” collection. It requires the ex-
ecutive branch to secure explicit ap-
proval from the FISA court for collec-
tion. It further objects “abouts” collec-
tions to—subjects a 30-day congres-
sional review process.
I know Mr. SENNENBRENER said nobody can do any-
thing in 30 days, but I think we can.
This bill strengthens the privacy and
civil liberties oversight board. That
was something I was instrumental in
establishing when I was on the Intelli-
gen Committee. I know it is impor-
tant, but I also know that it has to be
strengthened and it has to be respected
as a watchdog.
So, I mean, the list goes on requiring
public reporting on the use of 702 data,
just saying to the intelligence commu-
nity: Don't try to minimize any viola-
tions that may happen; we want the facts; we want the truth.
And that is why I am so glad it has
expanded whistleblower protections
and briefings to the Oversight Com-
mittee, which we have required. Unlike
the original House Intelligence bill,
which I opposed, this bill does not in-
clude language that would have likely
expanded the universe of FISA targets
who are now, as I mentioned before,
agents of foreign policy powers. It ex-
cludes the language on unmasking;
somebody tell the President.
It gives me great pride in our Caucus,
if you could have heard the beautiful
debate between Mr. NADLER and Mr.
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SCHIFF on this subject. We are not that far apart. I think that the motion to recommit addresses most of the concerns we have been getting from the outside groups, and communities have dedicated their—whose organized purpose is to protect the civil liberties of the American people.

But, again, with great respect for everyone’s opinions and whatever they have put forth, again, saluting our men and women in the intelligence community for the work that they do, we want to ensure we are strengthening our hand in terms of protecting the national security of our country, which is our first responsibility, keep the American people safe, and, as we do so, to honor our oath of office to the Constitution, to honor the principles of the Constitution.

Our Founders knew full well the challenge between security and civil liberties. They lived in a world when they were under attack. The War of 1812 was over very soon after the establishment of our country, so this was not a foreign idea to them, and they beheld to us the responsibility to protect, defend, protect our liberties.

And, again, respectful of this debate on this bill will be following support my ranking member on the Intelligence Committee, Mr. SCHIFF, our ranking member, and Members will follow their conscience on this. I just wanted you to know, from my experience in all of this and with weighing the entities involved, that that is the path that I will take.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Judiciary Committee, to close the debate on this side.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I also thank the minority leader for her remarks in support of 702.

I rise in support of the 702 reauthorization. It is critical to our national security. You would see the color drain out of the faces of all of our security personnel, the entire national security community, if we lost the ability and went dark on 702.

We have got to follow through in this Congress. We have got to provide the flexibility for those of us who have got the tools that we have available to us, and we have set up procedures that will approve of this annually under the FISA courts. We have got a probable cause requirement for any criminal investigation. That protects U.S. persons. And we don’t need to be protecting anything but U.S. persons when it comes to this.

The gentlewoman spoke of civil liberties, and I stand in defense of those civil liberties as well and in defense of the national security. We have got an IG report that is written into this bill.

But I would remind the people who are concerned about this focus on these civil liberties that Google and Facebook and Verizon and AT&T, they hold more data than the U.S. Government has. That is where the real information is, and if they are concerned about that, they should raise that issue.

Meanwhile, I am going to oppose the Amash amendment and support the reauthorization of 702. Our people in this America, U.S. persons, deserve that protection for national security reasons. I urge its adoption.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, strike line 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Uniting and Strengthening America by Reforming and Improving the Government’s High-Tech Surveillance Act” or the “USA RIGHTS Act.”

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Clarification on prohibition on querying of collections of communications to conduct warrantless queries for the communications of United States persons and persons inside the United States.
Sec. 3. Prohibition on reverse targeting under certain authorities of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.
Sec. 4. Prohibition on acquisition, pursuant to certain FISA authorities to target certain persons outside the United States, of communications that do not include communications of United States persons and persons inside the United States.
Sec. 5. Prohibition on acquisition of entirely domestic communications under authorities to target certain persons outside the United States.
Sec. 6. Limitation on use of information obtained under certain authority of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1947 relating to United States persons.
Sec. 7. Reforms of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.
Sec. 8. Improved role in oversight of electronic surveillance by amici curiae appointed by courts under Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.
Sec. 9. Reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.
Sec. 10. Study and report on diversity and representation on the FISA Court and the FISA Court of Review.
Sec. 11. Grounds for determining injury in fact in civil action relating to secret surveillance under certain provisions of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.
Sec. 12. Clarification of applicability of requirement to declassify significant decisions of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review.
Sec. 14. Limitation on technical assistance from electronic communication service providers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.
Sec. 15. Modification of authorities for public reporting by persons subject to nondisclosure requirement accompanying order under Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.
Sec. 16. Annual publication of statistics on number of persons targeted outside the United States under certain Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 authority.
Sec. 17. Repeal of nonapplicability to Federal Bureau of Investigation of certain reporting requirements under Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.
Sec. 18. Publication of estimates regarding communications collected under certain provision of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

SECOND. CLARIFICATION ON PROHIBITION ON QUERYING OF COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS TO CONDUCT WARRANTLESS QUERIES FOR THE COMMUNICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PERSONS AND PERSONS INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

Section 702(b) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and indenting such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, an additional two ems from the left margin;

(2) by striking “an acquisition” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An acquisition”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CLARIFICATION ON PROHIBITION ON QUERYING OF COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PERSONS AND PERSONS INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), no officer or employee of the United States may conduct a query of information acquired under this section in an effort to find communications of or about a particular United States person or a person inside the United States.

“(B) CONCURRENT ACT; USE OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE FOR CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION; AND EXCEPTION FOR EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a query for communications related to a particular United States person or person inside the United States if—

“(i) such United States person or person inside the United States is the subject of an order or emergency authorization authorizing electronic surveillance or physical search under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of this Act, or under title 18, United States Code, for the effective period of that order;

“(ii) the entity carrying out the query has a reasonable belief that the life or safety of such United States person or person inside the United States is threatened; and

“(iii) the information is sought for the purpose of assisting that person;
(iii) such United States person or person in the United States is a corporation; or

(iv) such United States person or person inside the United States has consented to the query.

(3) Queries of Federated Data Sets and Mixed Data.—If an officer or employee of the United States conducts a query of a data set, or of a subset thereof, that includes any information acquired under this section, the system shall be configured not to return such information unless the officer or employee enters a code or other information indicating that—

(i) the person associated with the search term entered into a United States or person inside the United States; or

(ii) if the person associated with the search term is a United States person or person inside the United States, one or more of the conditions of subparagraph (B) are satisfied.

(4) Matters relating to emergency queries.—

(a) Exception to the coverage of subsection (a) is to acquire the communications of a particular, known person reasonably believed to be located in the United States; and

(b) in subsection (I)(2)(B)(i), by striking "ensure that" and inserting the following:

(1) that;

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

(I) that an application is filed under title 18, United States Code; or

(II) if the person associated with the search term is a United States person or person inside the United States, one or more of the conditions of subparagraph (B) are satisfied.

(b) Queried and derived information acquired under this section, the system shall be configured not to return such information unless the officer or employee enters a code or other information indicating that—

(i) the person associated with the search term entered into a United States or person inside the United States; or

(ii) if the person associated with the search term is a United States person or person inside the United States, one or more of the conditions of subparagraph (B) are satisfied.

(5) Matters relating to emergency queries.—

(1) Treatment of denials.—In the event that a query for communications related to a particular United States person or person inside the United States is conducted pursuant to an emergency authorization authorizing electronic surveillance or a physical search described in subsection (B)(i) and the application for such emergency authorization is denied, or in any other case in which the query has been conducted and no order is issued approving the query, Subparagraph (A)(ii) may be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, or political subdivision thereof.

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (G); and

(3) in subsection (g)(2)(A)(i)(I)—

(i) the person associated with the search term entered into a United States or person inside the United States; and

(ii) if the person associated with the search term is a United States person or person inside the United States, one or more of the conditions of subparagraph (B) are satisfied.

(b) Prohibition on acquisition, pursu-ant to certain FISA authorities to target certain persons outside the United States; and

(c) Where an application for such emergency authorization is denied, or in any other case in which the query has been conducted and no order is issued approving the query, information acquired under this section, the system shall be configured not to return such information unless the officer or employee enters a code or other information indicating that—

(i) the person associated with the search term entered into a United States or person inside the United States; or

(ii) if the person associated with the search term is a United States person or person inside the United States, one or more of the conditions of subparagraph (B) are satisfied.

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (G); and

(3) in inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

(E) may not acquire communications as to which no participant is a person who is targeted pursuant to the authorized acquisition; and

(4) in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (I)(2), by striking ''or to the Inspector of

(a) by adding at the end the following:

(i) Whistleblower complaints.—

(A) Submission to the Board of an employee of, or contractor or detailee to, an element of the intelligence community may submit to the Board a complaint or information that such employee, contractor, or detailee believes relates to a privacy or civil liberties concern. The confidentiality provisions under section 2409(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, shall apply to a submission under this subparagraph. Any disclosure under this subparagraph shall be protected against discrimination under the procedures, burdens of proof, and remedies set forth in section 2409 of such title.

(B) Authority of the Board.—The Board may take such action as the Board considers appropriate with respect to investigating a complaint or information submitted under paragraph (A) or transmitting such complaint or information to any other Executive agency or the congressional intelligence committees.

(C) Relationship to existing laws.—The authority under subparagraph (A) of an employee or contractor, or detailee to, an element of the intelligence community may submit to the Board a complaint or information shall be in addition to any other authority under another provision of law to submit a complaint or information. Any action taken under any other provision of law by the recipient of a complaint or information shall not preclude the Board from taking action relating to the same complaint or information.

(D) Relationship to actions taken under other laws.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prevent

(i) any individual from submitting a complaint or information to any authorized recipient of the complaint or information; or

(ii) the recipient of a complaint or information from taking independent action on the complaint or information.

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

(a) Definitions.—In this section, the terms "congressional intelligence committees" and "intelligence community" have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)."

(b) Prohibited Personnel Practices.—Section 706(a)(1)(B) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1825(a)(1)(B)), is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "or to the Inspector of

(iii) the purpose of such acquisition is to target a person inside the United States; and

(iv) absent the consent of such person, electronically acquired from an entity located entirely within the United States; and

(v) incapacitation or destruction of critical infrastructure (as defined in section 101(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 1553(e))); or

(vi) a cybersecurity threat from a foreign

country;
an agency or another employee designated by the head of the agency to receive such disclosures" and inserting "the Inspector General of an agency, a supervisor in the employment unit of the agency or other command (up to and including the head of the employing agency), the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, or an employee designated by any of the aforementioned individuals for the purpose of receiving such disclosures".

(b) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—Section 1061(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(g)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(ii) by striking paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) APPOINTMENT IN ABSENCE OF CHAIRMAN.—If the position of chairman of the Board is vacant, during the period of the vacancy or in the absence of the Chairman, the majority of the members of the Board, may exercise the authority of the chairman under paragraph (1).

(c) RIGHTS AND COMPENSATION OF PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee), as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is further amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) APPOINTMENT IN ABSENCE OF CHAIRMAN.—If the position of chairman of the Board is vacant, during the period of the vacancy or in the absence of the Chairman, the majority of the members of the Board, may exercise the authority of the chairman under paragraph (1).

(d) APPOINTMENT OF STAFF OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—Section 1061(i) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(i)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(ii) by striking paragraph (1) the following:

"(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting "full-time" after "4 additional"; and

(ii) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking ", except that", and all that follows through the end and inserting a period.

(2) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(5) APPROPRIATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by paragraph (1)—

(i) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) except as provided in paragraph (2), shall apply to any appointment to a position as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

(i) COMPENSATION CHANGES.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1)(B)(i) and (C) of paragraph (1) shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by paragraph (1)—

(1) shall have effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall apply to any appointment to a position as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) IN GENERAL.—An individual serving as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board before the date of the enactment of this Act, including a member continuing to serve as a member under section 1061(b)(4)(B) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(h)(4)(B)), referred to in this clause as a "current member") may be elected to—

(aa) serve as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board on a full-time basis and in accordance with section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee), as amended by this section; or

(bb) serve as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board on a part-time basis in accordance with such section 1061, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including the limitations of the term of the member under subsection (h)(4)(B) of such section, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(II) ELECTION TO SERVE FULL TIME.—A current member making an election under subsection (I)(aa) shall begin serving as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board on a full-time basis on the first day of the first pay period beginning not less than 60 days after the date on which the current member makes such election.

(f) PROVIDING INFORMATION ABOUT GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT TO THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—The Attorney General shall fully inform the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board about any activities carried out by the Government under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), including by providing to the Board—

(1) copies of each detailed report submitted to a committee of Congress under such Act; and

(2) copies of each decision, order, and opinion of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review required to be included in the report under section 601(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1871(a)).

SEC. 8. IMPROVED ROLE IN OVERSIGHT OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.—

(a) ROLE OF AMICI CURIAE GENERALLY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(i)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (10) as paragraphs (6) through (11), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

"(5) APPROPRIATION.—

(A) REFERRAL TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT ON BANC.—If the Court establishes under subsection (a) an amicus curiae under paragraph (2)(A) to assist the Court in the consideration of any matter presented to the Court under this Act and the Court makes a decision with respect to such matter, the Court, in response to an application by the amicus curiae or any other individual designated under paragraph (1), may refer the decision to the Court en banc for review as the Court considers appropriate.

(B) REFERRAL TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.—If the Court establishes under subsection (a) an amicus curiae under paragraph (2)(A) to assist the Court in the consideration of any matter presented to the Court under this Act and the Court makes a decision with respect to such matter, the Court, in response to an application by the amicus curiae or any other individual designated under paragraph (1), may refer the decision to the Supreme Court for review as the Court considers appropriate.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—

(A) REFERRAL TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW .—If the court considers appropriate.

(B) REFERRAL TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT ON BANC OF —Any individual designated pursuant to paragraph (1) may raise a legal or technical issue or any other issue that is relevant to the Court or the Court of Review at any time. If an amicus curiae is appointed under paragraph (2)(A)—

(A) the Court shall notify all other amici curiae designated under paragraph (1) of such appointment;

(B) the appointed amicus curiae may request, either directly or through the court, the assistance of the other amici curiae designated under paragraph (1); and

(C) all amici curiae designated under paragraph (1) may provide input to the court with respect to such input was formally requested by the court or the appointed amicus curiae.”.

(4) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—Section 103(i)(7) of such Act, as redesignated, is further amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking "that the court" and inserting the following: "that—"

(ii) by striking "and" at the end and inserting the following: "or"

(iii) by striking "that the court" and inserting the following: "or"

(ii) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

"(ii) shall have access to an unredacted copy of each decision made by a court established under subsection (a) or in which the court decides a question of law, notwithstanding whether the decision is classified; and"

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "may" and inserting "shall"; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking "CLASSIFIED INFORMATION" and inserting the following: "information designated by the court as "classified"

(ii) by striking "court may have access and inserting the following: "court—
“(1) shall have access to unredacted copies of each opinion, order, transcript, pleading, or other document of the Court and the Court of Review; and

“(2) upon request by the Chief Justice,

(5) PUBLIC NOTICE AND RECEIPT OF BRIEFS FROM THIRD PARTIES.—Section 103(i) of such Act, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) PUBLIC NOTICE AND RECEIPT OF BRIEFS FROM THIRD PARTIES.—Whenever a court established under subsection (a) or (b) considers a novel question of law that can be considered without disclosing classified information, sources, or methods, the court shall, in its discretion, consider such question in an open manner—

“(A) by publishing on its website each question of law that the court is considering; and

“(B) by accepting briefs from third parties relating to the question under consideration by the court.”

(2) SCHEDULE.—Section 702(1)(2) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(2) by adding at the end the following:

“[(B) PARTICIPATION OF AMICI CURIAE.—In reviewing a certification under subparagraph (A) from a judicial circuit, the district judge shall provide for a district judge to be designated for that position.

“(C) by striking ‘The Chief Justice shall designate 1 such district judge to be designated for that position.’ and inserting ‘The Chief Justice shall designate 1 such district judge to be designated for that position.’

“(D) by inserting before clause (i), as redesignated by subparagraph (C), the following:

“(1) the Chief Justice shall designate a district judge to be designated for that position.

“(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) PUBLIC NOTICE AND RECEIPT OF BRIEFS FROM THIRD PARTIES.—Whenever a court established under subsection (a) or (b) considers a novel question of law that can be considered without disclosing classified information, sources, or methods, the court shall, in its discretion, consider such question in an open manner—

“(A) by publishing on its website each question of law that the court is considering; and

“(B) by accepting briefs from third parties relating to the question under consideration by the court.”

(3) SCHEDULE.—Section 702(1)(3) of such Act is amended by striking “at least 30 days” and inserting “not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.”

(4) SCHEDULE.—Section 702(1)(4) of such Act is amended by striking “the court established under such paragraph (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and adjusting the margin of such clauses, as so redesignated, to an even number of lines” and inserting “such number of days before the expiration of such authorization as the Court considers necessary to comply with the requirements of paragraph (2)(B) or 30 days, whichever is greater”.

(c) PUBLIC NOTICE OF QUESTIONS OF LAW CERTIFIED FOR REVIEW.—Section 103(i) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) the Chief Justice shall designate a district judge to serve on the court established under such paragraph (A) in a judicial circuit, the Chief Justice shall designate such district judge to serve on the court established under such paragraph (A) in a judicial circuit to be designated for that position.

“(2) whenever a court established under subparagraph (A) denies an application for an order authorizing electronic surveillance under this Act, such judge shall provide immediately for the record a written statement of each reason for the judge’s decision and, on motion of the United States, the record shall be transmitted, under seal, to the court of review established in subsection (b).”

(5) PUBLIC NOTICE AND RECEIPT OF BRIEFS FROM THIRD PARTIES.—Whenever a court established under subsection (a) or (b) considers a novel question of law that can be considered without disclosing classified information, sources, or methods, the court shall, in its discretion, consider such question in an open manner—

“(A) by publishing on its website each question of law that the court is considering; and

“(B) by accepting briefs from third parties relating to the question under consideration by the court.”

(a) STUDY.—The Committee on Intercircuit Assignments of the Judicial Conference of the United States shall study on how to ensure judges are appointed to the court established under subsection (a) of section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805) and the court established under subsection (b) of such section in a manner that ensures such courts are diverse and representative.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Committee on Intercircuit Assignments shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under this subsection.

SEC. 11. GROUNDS FOR DETERMINING INJURY IN FACT IN CIVIL ACTION RELATING TO SURVEILLANCE ACT.

(a) STUDY.—The Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate shall study how to ensure that the communications of the person will be acquired under this section and 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Committee on Intercircuit Assignments shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under this subsection.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Committee on Intercircuit Assignments shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under this subsection.
SEC. 15. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES FOR PUBLIC REPORTING.

(a) Modification of Aggregation Bandings.—Section (a) of section 604 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1804) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) the number of United States persons whose communications are collected under an electronic surveillance pursuant to title I for the purposes of section 601;".

(b) Additional Disclosures.—Such section is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (d) as subsections (c) through (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) Additional Disclosures.—A person who publicly reports information under subsection (a) may also publicly report the following information, relating to the previous 180 days, using a semiannual report that indicates whether the person was or was not required to comply with an order, directive, or national security letter issued under each of sections 105, 402, 501, 702, 703, and 704 and the provisions listed in section 603(e)(3)."


Not less frequently than once each year, the Director of National Intelligence shall publish the following:

(a) A semiannual report that aggregates the number of orders, directives, or national security letters with which the person was required to comply into separate categories of—

(1) a person inside the United States.

(b) A semiannual report that aggregates the number of orders, directives, or national security letters with which the person was required to comply into separate categories of—

(1) the number of United States persons whose communications are collected under an electronic surveillance pursuant to title I for the purposes of section 601;"

SEC. 17. REPEAL OF NONAPPLICABILITY TO FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER CERTAIN PROVISION OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Section 603(d)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1802(d)(2)) is amended by striking—

"(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following: "(b) Limitations.—The Attorney General or the Director of National Intelligence may not request notification from an electronic communication service provider, or any other provider, regarding the identity of a person who is not a target of the surveillance;"

SEC. 18. PUBLICATION OF ESTIMATES REGARDING COMMUNICATIONS COLLECTED UNDER CERTAIN PROVISION OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) In General.—Except as provided in subsection (b), not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall publish an estimate of—

(1) the number of United States persons whose communications are collected under section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) in the last calendar year.

(b) In Case of Technical Impossibility.—If the Director determines that publishing an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) is not technically possible—

(1) subsection (a) shall not apply; and

(2) the Director shall publish an assessment in unclassified form explaining such determination, but may submit a classified annex to the appropriate committees of Congress as necessary.

(c) Appropriate Committees of Congress Defined.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003));
We definitely need to have a move toward more protection of our Fourth Amendment rights, and a warrant requirement in domestic criminal cases and a requirement that if you are doing a national security investigation and you find that the information is useful and the person is a criminal, you need a court order to get that information. This must be opposed. Under the USA RIGHTS Act, the intelligence community would not be able to query the name of the suspected terrorist supporter in the United States to see if he is in contact with terrorist recruiters. It would not be able to query the name of a person in the United States who is suspected of being a terrorist. It would not be able to query the name of a suspicious vehicle parked in front of the Washington Monument to see if that person is in contact with terrorist operatives overseas. We would not be able to query the name of a person in a criminal case and it is precluded from court are two major improvements to our 702 law that protect Americans' civil liberties. This bill must be passed. It is absolutely essential for our protection. It surveys people outside of the United States who are not United States citizens. The fact that it collects incidental information about U.S. citizens should not be a prohibition on this effort. But if you apply this amendment, you are not going to be able to have our national intelligence officials looking at this information carefully, and they are going to have to, in many instances, get a warrant when they need to act because they think it is a national security concern. A warrant either will be unattainable or it will be in a circumstance where it is too late, and, in both instances, we cannot allow that.

This bill provides balance. That bill goes too far. The amendment goes too far. I urge my colleagues to oppose it. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we pass this amendment. The government conducts 702 searches and broadly defines foreign intelligence investigations that may have no nexus to national security, and we are using this database for just criminal investigations that are domestic.

When you say "incidental collection," it sounds like it is not much. Well, the fact is it is a huge amount of data in its content. What this amendment says is: if you are going to search for the information of an American who has been collected in that database and it is not terrorism but domestic criminal investigation, get a warrant. Get a warrant. That is what the Fourth Amendment requires. Now, I took exception to the comment that 702 would go dark. We know that this existing FISA order goes through April, so the 702 program is not going dark. We have time to do this right. We have time to make sure that the FISA order is adhered to in the reauthorization of 702. Put the "foreign" back in the FISA bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to emphasize how dismayed I am by the amount of disinformation being propagated by opponents of section 702. I have heard some things over the last couple of days and I just wonder, how in the world can someone believe that.

Let me tell you why this amendment must be opposed. Under the USA RIGHTS Act, the intelligence community would not be able to query the name of the suspected terrorist supporter in the United States to see if he is in contact with terrorist recruiters. It would not be able to query the name of a person in the United States who is suspected of being a terrorist. It would not be able to query the name of a suspicious vehicle parked in front of the Washington Monument to see if that person is in contact with terrorist operatives overseas. We would not be able to query the name of a person in a criminal case and it is precluded from court are two major improvements to our 702 law that protect Americans' civil liberties. This bill must be passed. It is absolutely essential for our protection. It surveys people outside of the United States who are not United States citizens. The fact that it collects incidental information about U.S. citizens should not be a prohibition on this effort. But if you apply this amendment, you are not going to be able to have our national intelligence officials looking at this information carefully, and they are going to have to, in many instances, get a warrant when they need to act because they think it is a national security concern. A warrant either will be unattainable or it will be in a circumstance where it is too late, and, in both instances, we cannot allow that.

This bill provides balance. That bill goes too far. The amendment goes too far. I urge my colleagues to oppose it. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about terrorism. We are talking about the protection of Americans and their information. All of the rhetoric and the fear tactics that this will destroy our ability to go after terrorists is wrong.

The USA RIGHTS Act is important to protect Americans. The other side talks about protecting Americans. Let's protect their Fourth Amendment rights. We can protect them against terrorists if we amend this legislation with the USA RIGHTS Act and protect their rights under the Fourth Amendment.

Every American's data is being seized by the Justice Department, the CIA, and the NSA. We have asked them how many times that has been queried. They will not tell us because the information is massive. All we are saying under the USA RIGHTS Act is that, if you want to go into that information on Americans, get a warrant from a judge, not a query. You can't just search it. Get a warrant under the Fourth Amendment or stay out of that information and still go after terrorists under 702 and under FISA.
We need to have this amendment to make the bill better to protect Americans overseas and at home.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment that my colleagues and I have drafted and share the sponsor’s commitment to privacy and civil liberties, but this amendment would go vastly beyond the legislation advanced by either the Intelligence Committee or the Judiciary Committee. It would prevent the intelligence community from querying lawfully collected 702 information, even in situations directly related to counterterrorism and national security. It would make section 702 a far less effective tool at a significant cost to the national security of the United States.

The amendment would require a probable cause warrant or its equivalent before the government can query lawfully collected 702 data in an effort to find communications concerning someone who may be a U.S. person or a foreign person located in the United States even when such person is communicating with foreign terrorists or intelligence targets.

Probable cause will be lacking in many, if not most, intelligence and counterterrorism contexts. In such situations, the USA RIGHTS Act would prevent the government from detecting and disrupting plots against Americans or identifying and preventing foreign espionage on our soil.

It would also require publication of information related to 702 certifications that would disclose the sources and methods of intelligence gathering, imperilling our ability to obtain foreign intelligence information. That, to me, poses an intolerably high risk.

Instead, the underlying bill strikes a far better compromise. In the underlying bill, a warrant would be required in most nonnational security and nonterrorism cases when there is an open investigation. In the absence of such a warrant, the bill provides that evidence that would be obtained would be excluded from use in court.

That seems, to me, a very sensible balance: requiring a warrant in most nonnational security and nonterrorism cases and providing, in the absence of such a warrant in an open investigation, that information or evidence would be barred from use in court.

That addresses the gravamen of the concern over this program that it could be used for fishing expeditions against ordinary Americans. This amendment, on the other hand, would largely cripple the program. Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I urge opposition to the amendment and support for the underlying bill.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, any responsible effort to authorize section 702 must pass three tests:

It must include a meaningful warrant requirement; it must end the “abouts” collection until Congress says otherwise; and it must not restrict the government’s ability to collect intelligence on valid targets operating outside of the United States.

The underlying bill does not include a meaningful warrant requirement, and it does not end “abouts” collection.

The Amash-Lofgren amendment, on the other hand, passes all three tests:

It includes a warrant agreement that comports with the Fourth Amendment; it puts an end to “abouts” collection; and it leaves the core functionality of section 702 perfectly intact. It would be harder to use this authority to spy on United States citizens, but the government’s ability to gather intelligence on suspected terrorists and others overseas will not be affected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and make a meaningful change to section 702.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the many sponsors of this amendment for their leadership in this important fight.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment being offered and in support of the underlying bill and the increased transparency it provides to the body of the intelligence community and the American public that it protects.

I thank the ranking member and also Chairman GOODLATTE for allowing me to have this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want Americans at home to know what this program is not. It is not a dragnet surveillance program; it is not a program that could ever be used to target Americans; and it is not an intelligence-gathering tool. In fact, it may be one of the most heavily overseen programs that we have. This bill strengthens that accountability.

As former ranking member of the Intelligence Committee and Representative of the district that is home to NSA, I have taken many of my colleagues in this Chamber on trips to NSA so that they can see firsthand how these programs work to protect Americans and an important part of our freedom and civil liberties.

This is not a debate on constitutionality. The Federal courts have affirmed that this program’s current authorization and operation are legal and consistent with the Fourth Amendment. This brave law has vowed several times with bipartisan majorities to reauthorize it.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment—I think it is in the wrong direction—and to support the underlying bill.

The bill, I think, strikes a balance. Americans cherish and strongly want us to protect their privacy. We all agree on that, and I think this bill threads the needle. The underlying bill protects our Fourth Amendment through the FISA process through this improved effort.

We know we live in a dangerous world. Terrorism is a constant threat that we all clearly understand. When we take our oath of office, we swear to protect and defend our Nation from all enemies, foreign and domestic. I believe this underlying bill does that with increased transparency.

Clearly, it is not perfect. We never vote on any perfect legislation. But this is an improved piece of legislation. The amendment is an overreach in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRANNER).

Mr. SENSENBRANNER. Mr. Speaker, when James Madison wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, one of his overriding concerns was to prevent any branch of the three in government from becoming too powerful. That is why he put the checks and balances in the Constitution, so that the other branches could oversee and make sure that a branch that was trying to push the edge of the envelope would not be able to succeed in that.

The warrant amendment that has been talked about quite a bit today during the debate really is not effective. It is nothing at all. It ends up putting James Madison’s legacy into the trash bin of history, and it does not seem to go there.

Yesterday, The Washington Post reported that FBI officials told aides of Mr. NADLER that, under the proposed bill—meaning the underlying bill—they anticipate rarely, if ever, needing permission from the FISC to review query results. So this warrant requirement of the supporters of the bill and the opponents of the amendment basically doesn’t mean anything at all because the FBI told Mr. NADLER’s aides that that was the case.

Now, we have a debate here today on whether to put the F back into the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. The F means “foreign.” That is why
the amendment should be adopted, or, if it fails, then the underlying bill should be defeated.

This is a time to stand up for the oath of office that every one of us took one year ago to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

The only way we can do that today is by supporting the Amash amendment and defeating the underlying bill.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Congress has sometimes made the difficult job of the intelligence community harder by not providing adequate context and oversight. We have created a vast Department of Homeland Security, a vast security sprawling intelligence network that results in the collection of data that my friend, Mr. POE, talked about. Yes, warrants can sometimes be inconvenient, but we have judged it as a small price to pay to protect Americans from government overreach.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, service-members in the combat zone depend on 702 to keep them safe. 702 must continue to gather information on foreign terrorists to keep us and service-members safe. However, Americans in uniform serve to preserve an ideal that the Constitution protects the rights of Americans.

The bill, unamended, enshrines in law the abuse of the Fourth Amendment rights of American citizens, and it just cannot happen. This is not only about criminal prosecution but about political persecution.

Mr. Speaker, that abuse and the associated persecution is unfolding on the front pages and on TV right before us today. Don’t lower the bar any further.

Vote to preserve the rights of American citizens. Vote for this amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to whether the gentleman has additional speakers?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me pose a hypothetical about the Amash amendment. In the criminal world, if an FBI agent is told through a tip that someone has just purchased unusual amounts of fertilizer that could be used to make a bomb, the Amash amendment would prevent that FBI agent from looking at the FBI’s databases to determine if the suspicious individual’s email address or other identifier—not the content of the email, just the email address or identifier—is located in the 702 database.

What would the American people say if we hamper our law enforcement from protecting them? What would people of this country say if we had another Murrah Building blow up and the FBI couldn’t look at an email address?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, me pose a hypothetical about the Amash amendment. In the criminal world, if an FBI agent is told through a tip that someone has just purchased unusual amounts of fertilizer that could be used to make a bomb, the Amash amendment would prevent that FBI agent from looking at the FBI’s databases to determine if the suspicious individual’s email address or other identifier—not the content of the email, just the email address or identifier—is located in the 702 database.

What would the American people say if we hamper our law enforcement from protecting them? What would people of this country say if we had another Murrah Building blow up and the FBI couldn’t look at an email address?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this body cannot be afraid of the Constitution. It has been our guiding moral force for this Nation for all of our beginnings and our nows.

This amendment is truly an amendment that will protect the American people and America. It is the data of American citizens that is under the scrutiny of the FBI. We have covered many things in this Congress, but I would argue this is the most important moment in the time that I have been in this building.

Not only is the Fourth Amendment at stake, so, too, I would argue, are due process under the Fifth and Fourteenth.

We must stand strong for individual liberty and privacy. That is who we are as a nation. If we do not put the “F” back in FISA, it becomes ISA, and all eyes are on you.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the underlying bill.

As a former Army ranger, I know the importance of section 702 in defeating the enemies of our country. The for¬eign enemies of our country are not subject to the protections of our Constitution; American citizens, however, are.

The supporters of the underlying bill would have you believe that the only way to secure America is by ignoring the Fourth Amendment, and I strongly disagree. It is the data of American citizens that is at subject here. The Fourth Amendment does not change when communications shift from the Postal Service, also in the hands of the government, to a database. It should be protected by the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support of the Amash amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have 3 3⁄4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 1⁄2 minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment and support the underlying bill.

I served a year in Iraq, and every day we got foreign intelligence information to us. Why? Because it helped us prepare. It helped us plan. It helped us deter. It helped us save American lives—only the lives of our troops in theater, but the lives of people at home.

I am all in favor of protecting American citizens and their privacy; do not get me wrong. I hope that, in the information we collected in theater, there were no Americans involved.

But guess what this amendment will do. It will virtually guarantee that ter¬rorists are going to make sure that they have an American, complicit or otherwise, involved with every one of their communications, email, or through a phone call. Why? Because that protects them. That will protect terrorists.

That is what this amendment would do. That is why I oppose the amend¬ment and stand in favor of the under¬lying bill.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, my amendment protects the rights of Americans consistent with the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Amash amendment and in strong opposition to the under¬lying bill.

As a former Army ranger, I know the importance of section 702 in defeating the enemies of our country. The for¬eign enemies of our country are not subject to the protections of our Constitution; American citizens, however, are.

The supporters of the underlying bill would have you believe that the only way to secure America is by ignoring the Fourth Amendment, and I strongly disagree. It is the data of American citizens that is at subject here. The Fourth Amendment does not change when communications shift from the Postal Service, also in the hands of the government, to a database. It should be protected by the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support of the Amash amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I re¬serve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Penn¬sylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, service¬members in the combat zone depend on 702 to keep them safe. 702 must con¬tinue to gather information on foreign terrorists to keep us and servici¬members safe. However, Americans in uniform serve to preserve an ideal that the Constitution protects the rights of Americans.

The bill, unamended, enshrines in law the abuse of the Fourth Amendment rights of American citizens, and it just cannot happen. This is not only about criminal prosecution but about political persecution.

Mr. Speaker, that abuse and the asso¬ciated persecution is unfolding on the front pages and on TV right before us today. Don’t lower the bar any further.

Vote to preserve the rights of Ameri¬can citizens. Vote for this amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen¬tleman from Virginia has 1 1⁄2 minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, may I in¬quire as to whether the gentleman has additional speakers?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute remaining.

Mr. Speaker, let me pose a hypo¬thetical about the Amash amendment. In the criminal world, if an FBI agent is told through a tip that someone has just purchased unusual amounts of fer¬tilizer that could be used to make a bomb, the Amash amendment would prevent that FBI agent from looking at the FBI’s databases to determine if the suspicious individual’s email address or other identifier—not the content of the email, just the email address or identifier—is located in the 702 database.

What would the American people say if we hamper our law enforcement from protecting them? What would people of this country say if we had another Murrah Building blow up and the FBI couldn’t look at an email address?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, may I in¬quire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen¬tleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBINSON).

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, is it true that Americans in the combat zone are not given the access to information they need to protect our troops in theater and to defeat enemies of our country?

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the patron of this amendment for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have covered many things in this Congress, and over the past year, to include tax policy, healthcare, helping evic¬erate ISIS, but I would argue this is the most important moment in the time that I have been in this building.

Not only is the Fourth Amendment at stake, so, too, I would argue, are due process under the Fifth and Fourteenth.

We must stand strong for individual liberty and privacy. That is who we are as a nation. If we do not put the “F” back in FISA, it becomes ISA, and all eyes are on you.
The underlying bill allows the government to warrantlessly collect an astounding volume of Americans’ communications, makes no material reforms to the collection and use of that data against Americans, and explicitly allows even more surveillance than the law currently permits.

In contrast, USA RIGHTS allows the government to conduct broad foreign surveillance and share intelligence throughout the relevant agencies, but it also adds protections to prevent the erosion of Americans’ Fourth Amendment rights.

These are two very different options, Mr. Speaker, but for all of us who care about civil liberties, who believe the United States can protect itself without retreating the Fourth Amendment, and who believe Congress has an independent obligation to protect the Constitution, the choice is clear: support the USA RIGHTS amendment.

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first, I just want to say to all my colleagues that I respect the passionate views that are on display here. I think this has been a very passionate and interesting debate. What I would like to do is try and bring a little clarity to this debate.

I want to thank the minority leader for coming up and speaking against the Amash amendment and in favor of the underlying bipartisanship amendment.

We, on a bipartisan basis, have been working with the Senate and the White House to get this right, to add even more privacy protections to the law, even more than the status quo, to add the warrant requirement that this underlying bill has.

Let’s try to clear up some of the confusion. There has been wide reporting and discussion here in the House about parts of the FISA statute that affect citizens. It is a big law. It is a big statute with lots of pieces. Title I of the FISA law is what you see in the news that applies to U.S. citizens. That is not what we are talking about here. This is Title VII, section 702.

This is about foreign terrorists on foreign soil. That is what this is about. So let’s clear up some of the confusion here. Let me give you two examples of what this program has done to keep our people safe, two declassified examples.

Number one, this program, in March of 2009, helped us identify intelligence we needed to go after and kill ISIS’ financial minister, because of the intelligence collected under this program, a foreign terrorist on foreign soil, the number two man at ISIS who was in line to become the next leader. This program helped us get the information to stop him.

I came here before 9/11. I remember hearing upon hearing in the 9/11 Commission about the old firewall. We were seeing what was going on overseas, terrorists like Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan were doing all these things, and we couldn’t pass that information on to our authorities here in America. We had this firewall to prevent us from connecting the dots. That was the big phrase we used back then in the early 2000s.

If we pass the Amash amendment, we bring that firewall right back up. You pass that amendment and defeat this underlying bill, we go back to those days where we are flying blind on protecting our country from terrorism.

Let me give Members an example. This program has not only stopped many attacks, but let me tell you about one: a plot in 2009 to blow up New York’s subway system. This was used to understand what people were planning overseas and what they were trying to do here in America so that we could connect the dots and stop that particular terrorist attack.

That is why this has to be renewed. That is why, among many other reasons, section 702, a program designed to go after foreign terrorists on foreign soil, is so essential. If this Amash amendment passes, it kills the program.

If this underlying bill fails, there is one of two things that will happen. The status quo will be continued, meaning no additional privacy protections, no warrant requirement—status quo. That doesn’t do anything to advance the concerns that have been voiced on the floor or even worse: 702 goes down. We don’t know what the consequences are really high. One of the most important things we are placed in charge to do is to make decisions to keep our country safe. This strikes the balance that we have to have between honoring and protecting privacy rights of U.S. citizens, honoring civil liberties, and making sure that we have the tools we need in this day and age of 21st century terrorism to keep our people safe. That is what this does. That is why I ask every everyone, on a bipartisan basis, to vote “no” on the Amash amendment and to vote “yes” on the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH). The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

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

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.
Mr. Himes. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to commit the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. Himes. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit the bill.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. Himes moves to commit S. 139 to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 4, line 3, strike "predicated".

Page 4, line 4, strike "opened".

Page 6, line 21, insert "or" after the semicolon.

Page 7, line 5, strike "or" and all that follows through line 12 and insert a period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. Himes. Mr. Speaker, members of the Intelligence Committee, on which so few of us have an opportunity to serve, lead very odd lives. Every single day, we descend in the bowels of this Capitol, four floors down. We surrender our iPhones, we surrender our BlackBerrys, and we go into windowless rooms where, on a daily basis, we hear about some of the most grotesque threats to American safety and interests that you can imagine: threats to American lives, threats to American interests, and threats to our very way of life.

We see, every day, how essential 702 authorities are. The intelligence that we gather under this authority is critical to our safety, our security, and our lives. It saves lives. This program can be really brief today. I want to thank all of my colleagues. There are a lot of strong opinions on both sides of the aisle on this issue, and we have taken many steps at the House Intelligence Committee to take Members out to the aisle on this issue, and we have taken steps at the House Intelligence Committee to take Members out to the aisle on this issue, through many markups, on this issue, through many markups,

I deeply appreciate the efforts of many in this Chamber that oppose this bill, the efforts that they have made. Each and every one of us wears an oath to protect and defend the Constitution, and no one should ever be criticized for working hard to make sure that that process is served; not Mr. Nadler, not Ms. Lofgren, not Mr. Amash, not Mr. Fox.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent much of the last several days trying to improve this bill with respect to civil liberties. I presented amendments to the Rules Committee which were, sadly, not made in current form. But the fact is that these protections exist. There are strict processes and procedures in place at the FBI as to how exactly U.S.-person information can be queried and used. On top of that, the entire 702 program is reviewed by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, the PCLOB, and is subject to meaningful congressional oversight by each and every one of us. To authorize this program each year, a Federal judge must find it has met all statutory requirements and is consistent with the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, three district courts and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals have deemed this program constitutional.

But, Mr. Speaker, no bill is perfect, and so the motion I offer would encompass all FBI matters—not just predicated investigations, but all FBI matters not related to national security—and require court orders founded on probable cause before the FBI could access U.S.-person information under 702.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical national security asset. It is as important as our best operator, as our best technology, as our most powerful weapons, and I appreciate the efforts that have been made to secure our civil liberties. This motion to commit pushes this bill slightly in the right direction by putting the meaningful improvements to the status quo, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. Nunes. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Nunes. Mr. Speaker, I will just be really brief today. I want to thank all of my colleagues. There are a lot of strong opinions on both sides of the aisle on this issue, and we have taken many steps at the House Intelligence Committee to take Members out to the aisle on this issue, through many markups, through many committees, and then even today on the floor here in the House of Representatives, has been a tough fight because it is a tough issue.

But in closing, this really is a compromise. We worked with the House Judiciary Committee for many months. I can’t thank Chairman Goodlatte enough for all of his very difficult work in trying to find a compromise. At the same time, the House Intelligence Committee, we have worked to come down to the SCIF to read all of the information because, at the end of the day, we all take the American people’s constitutional right to privacy very seriously.

I think the robust debate that has occurred in this House over the last year on this issue, through many markups,

Ms. Sinema, Messrs. Thompson of California, Frelinghuysen, Marchant, and Ms. Wasserman Schultz changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. Walz, Ms. Clarke of New York, Messrs. O’Rourke, Welch, and Meeks changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.
This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 2, not voting 19, as follows:

**[Roll No. 17]**

**YEAS—410**

Abraham
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barton
Beatty
Berman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brat
Buck
Budd
Burgess
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Crawley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Deffenbaugh
DeGette
DeLauro
Deloach
Delugi
Dedmon
Dewhurst
Deutch
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Davis, Jerry
Davis, Jim<br>Yeas: 410
Nays: 2
Not Voting: 19

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

**The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.**

**NOT VOTING—12**

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

**The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.**

**MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 875. An act to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on fiscal requirements under the Universal Service Fund programs.

**NAYS—19**

**NOT VOTING—19**

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

**The SPEAKER pro tempore. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.**

**MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 875. An act to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on fiscal requirements under the Universal Service Fund programs.
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill and amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4708

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act.’’

SEC. 2. ENHANCED DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY COORDINATION THROUGH THE BLUE CAMPAIGN.

(a) In General.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 434. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN.

"(a) Definition.—In this section, the term ‘‘human trafficking’’ means an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

"(b) Establishment.—There is established within the Department a program, which shall be known as the ‘‘Blue Campaign.’’ The Blue Campaign shall be headed by a Director, who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

"(c) Purpose.—The purpose of the Blue Campaign shall be to unify and coordinate Department efforts to address human trafficking.

"(d) Responsibilities.—The Secretary, working through the Director, shall, in accordance with subsection (e):

(1) issue Department-wide guidance to appropriate Department personnel;

(2) develop training programs for such personnel;

(3) coordinate departmental efforts, including training for such personnel; and

(4) provide guidance and training on trauma-informed practices to ensure that human trafficking victims are afforded prompt access to victim support service providers, in addition to the assistance required under section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105), to address their immediate and long-term needs.

"(e) Guidance and Training.—The Blue Campaign shall provide guidance and training to Department personnel and other Federal, State, tribal, and law enforcement personnel, as appropriate, regarding—

(1) programs to help identify instances of human trafficking;

(2) the types of information that should be collected and recorded in information technology systems utilized by the Department to help identify individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking;

(3) systematic and routine information sharing within the Department and among Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies regarding—

(A) individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking; and

(B) patterns and practices of human trafficking;

(4) techniques to identify suspected victims of trafficking along the United States border and at airport security checkpoints;

(5) methods to be used by the Transportation Security Administration and personnel from other appropriate agencies to—

(A) train employees of the Transportation Security Administration to identify suspected victims of trafficking; and

(B) serve as a liaison and resource regarding human trafficking prevention to appropriate State, local, and private sector aviation workers and the traveling public;

(6) utilizing resources, such as indicator cards, fact sheets, pamphlets, posters, brochures, and radio and television campaigns to—

(A) educate partners and stakeholders; and

(B) increase public awareness of human trafficking;

(7) leveraging partnerships with State and local governmental, nongovernmental, and private sector organizations to raise public awareness of human trafficking; and

(8) any other activities the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the Blue Campaign.

"(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 433 the following new item:

"Sec. 434. Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign.’’

SEC. 3. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure, in accordance with the Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance required under section 434(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2 of this Act, the integration of information technology systems utilized within the Department to record and track information regarding individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking (as such term is defined in such section).

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) describes the status and effectiveness of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign under section 434 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2 of this Act; and

(2) provides a recommendation regarding the appropriate office within the Department of Homeland Security for the Blue Campaign.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated $819,000 to carry out section 434 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY), my friend and the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider two measures from the Financial Services Committee: first, H.R. 2954, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Adjustment Act, sponsored by Representative TOM EMMER. This bill would provide targeted regulatory relief to our local community banks and credit unions; second, H.R. 3326, the World Bank Accountability Act, sponsored by Representative ANDY BARR.

Mr. Speaker, next week, our Nation’s Capital will also welcome tens of thousands of Americans to Washington for the annual March for Life. In conjunction, the House will vote on H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, sponsored by Representative MARSHA BLACKBURN. This bill simply states that doctors must provide medical care to any child born alive after a failed abortion.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are expected, including legislation to address government funding and other expiring priorities. I will be sure to inform all Members as soon as any additional items are added to our schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

I presume the CR, or continuing resolution, is anticipated, as the gentleman referenced. Is that accurate?

Mr. Speaker, I yield my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, we have been in discussions to try to get a budget agreement. We have hopes we can get that done this time. If we are able to get that budget agreement, we will need some time for the appropriators to do their work, so we would have a continuing resolution.
Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that.

Will that continuing resolution be clean, from the gentleman’s standpoint—that is to say, it will not include other items on it—or does the gentleman have any anticipation that other things might be included on that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I had the opportunity to be at the White House with the President earlier this week. He and I are attempting to work on seeing if we can make sure that we protect our DREAMers. I think we showed a united front in opinion in the White House among the 17 Republicans and 7 or 8 Democrats who were there that it ought to be done. I was pleased the President said that it ought to be done, and ought to be done quickly. I appreciate the gentleman’s efforts on that score.

Obviously, we also need to do something with the Children’s Health Insurance Program. We have talked about that before.

We need to do something with respect to the supplemental for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, as well as Florida and Texas. Obviously, we passed a supplemental here, and it did not pass in the Senate. Hopefully, the Senate will address that, and we can address it coming back across the aisle.

In addition, we are going to have to, as the gentleman referred to, establish caps. We still, at this late hour, late date, do not have a figure for the Appropriations Committee to use in terms of what they will mark their bills to. You mentioned it, but does the gentleman have any update or degree of confidence that will be done within the next few days?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the negotiations have been progressing further, as they have for the last month or so. I believe, as we both know, that the need of this funding for our military. I believe that the military should not be held hostage, for any other issue.

So I believe we can get to a solution here, and I am hopeful that those who have been negotiating can find common ground in the next day or two so that we can move forward. Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, nobody has any intention, of course, of holding the military hostage.

Secretary Mattis and his predecessors have all believed that a CR is damaging to the military’s ability to move forward and plan. I would suggest to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, that it is equally damaging to the nondefense side of the budget. Administrators and secretaries cannot plan for what resources they will have a month out, 2 months out, or until September 30 and the end of the fiscal year. Reaching agreement is important on both sides of the budget.

In addition, I would respectfully hope that we can pursue the policy and agreement that we made and on which Speaker Ryan, as principal on your side of the aisle and Senator Murray was the principal on our side of the aisle and reached agreement on the parity of increase—not parity of expenditures, because we spend more on defense, but parity of increase. Mr. Speaker, I would hope we could pursue that. It would accelerate agreement on how we are going forward.

I know the gentleman is going to be working on both of those efforts. I appreciate what he has said and look forward to working with him.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 2018, TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 2018

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, Friday, January 12, the Speaker pro tempore meet in the Speaker’s Office on Tuesday, next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL S. 139

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 98
Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill S. 139, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following correction: Amend the long title so as to read: “An Act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to improve foreign intelligence collection and the safeguards, accountability, and oversight of acquisitions of foreign intelligence, to extend title VII of such Act, and for other purposes.”

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as chairman of the Committee on the Budget:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, DC, JANUARY 10, 2018.

HON. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, It has been my great honor to serve as Chairman of the Budget Committee in the 115th Congress. I am proud that we completed our work when the House passed the most conservative budget in two decades, with $335 billion in cuts to mandatory spending and paved the way for tax reform. While I do wish the Senate had adopted our resolution, I believe that we have begun to change the culture in our party. I am hopeful we can continue to deliver on our promise.

With the FY18 Budget and tax reform complete, I am now respectfully stepping down as Chair of the House Budget Committee, effective Thursday, January 11, 2018.

Last summer, I announced that I would run for Governor of Tennessee in 2018. I had previously forestalled that decision to devote myself to the duties of serving as Budget Committee Chair in 2017—an opportunity that I did not foresee, but one that I felt honored and committed to undertake to ensure our House Republican majority passed a bold, conservative and balanced budget.

I would like to thank President Trump and Vice President Pence for their support of our House budget and leading the way on tax reform. It has been an honor working closely with both of them this year. I am grateful to the people of the Sixth District for giving me the privilege of fighting on their behalf in Congress.

Sincerely,

DIANE BLACK,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Ethics:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, DC, JANUARY 10, 2018.

HON. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Thank you for the privilege of serving for the past 5 years on the House Ethics Committee. While few, if any, members seek this assignment, the collegiality of the members coupled with the
After Mr. Womack.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to a growing humanitarian crisis, one that is often forgotten in news around the world. Venezuela is suffering through a collapse of its economy and Venezuela's children are starving to death.

According to a recent media report, the number of cases of severe malnutrition has nearly tripled in the years since the economic collapse, and doctors believe that 2018 will be even worse.

The Venezuelan Government has taken pains to hide the impact that the collapse has had on its population and the role their own repressive policies have played, but the recent statistics tell the true story. From 2012 to 2015, the mortality rate of infants under 4 weeks old has increased tenfold.

In 2016, 11,466 see a minimal age of 1 year old have died, an increase of 30 percent. Families and children now dig through trash in the hopes of finding food. This is a crisis we cannot turn a blind eye to. We must work together to address this. I urge my colleagues to keep this at the forefront of our consideration.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak against this administration’s choice to end the temporary protective status designation for El Salvador. Because of this disheartening and potentially dangerous decision, 200,000 people who have been legally living and working in the United States will be forced to go back to a country they don’t know, a country that still hasn’t fully recovered from the devastating earthquakes but is in the grips of widespread gang violence with one of the world’s highest murder rates. These families have chosen to stay here.

In my district, the TPS recipients from El Salvador have become integral and embedded in our communities. They are longtime loyal employees; they have started families; they have started businesses; and yes, they pay taxes. If they are removed, our country would lose over $100 billion in annual wages and billions would be lost from Social Security and Medicare contributions, and employers would experience hundreds of millions in turnover costs.

Congress should right this wrong and pass the American Promise Act so that these TPS recipients can continue to work and live in our communities and contribute to our country.

VENEZUELA’S GROWING HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment in the Democratic Party and to express my concern for the safety and security of the American people.
It has become evident that Democratic leaders and the rest of their party are more interested in protecting illegal immigrants and foreign nationals than protecting American citizens and passing a budget to avoid a government shutdown.

As a government, we are charged with supporting the well-being and safety of all American citizens. In order to fulfill this responsibility, we must secure our borders, end chain migration, and mandate E-Verify as a national practice.

We don’t need to promote the practice of rewarding illegal aliens by providing jobs and safe havens, but, rather, our obligation is to law-abiding American citizens.

We cannot take care of the rest of the world if we are unable to take care of America and its citizens first.

AFL-CIO 2018 MLK CONFERENCE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, I will join the AFL-CIO’s 2018 MLK Conference in dealing with civil and human rights. At that time, we will discuss the GOP tax scam that stops the labor movement in its tracks because 83 percent of the tax cuts go to the wealthiest 1 percent and raises taxes on 86 million.

I invite my constituents to join me from 1 to 3 at the Hilton Americas, where we will be talking about the labor movement and the devastation of the GOP tax scam on the American people.

At the same time, I am glad that I live in a nation that welcomes those who want to serve coming from other countries and live up to the ideals of this country. I want to pay tribute to Rose and Jose Escobar. Jose came to this country under TPS from El Salvador. It is important that this family not be broken up. Jose was unfairly deported and deserves humanitarian parole to come back to be with his loving wife, a citizen who works for the Texas Medical Center, and his two wonderful children.

TPS, again, is not violating or jeopardizing the American people’s security. It is a reflection of our compassion, our humanity, and our respect for those who come to this Nation fleeing persecution and devastation. To send back Haitians, to send back El Salvadorans will be a terrible tragedy, and to send back our DREAMers will be worse. Let’s work as Americans to make this country what it is: our greatest country in the world.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday I attended the 102nd Annual Pennsylvania Farm Show. It was great to speak to and see so many constituents there supporting and learning about our agriculture community.

The farm show is special to Pennsylvania. It is the largest indoor agricultural event. It showcases more than 12,000 competitive exhibits, more than half of which are animal exhibits. More than 1,000 exhibitors and competitors were from my congressional district.Likely, who was showing Polled Hereford beef cattle.

It is well known for its delicious food, which I enjoyed and which raises money for nonprofits that support our agriculture community. This farm show highlights just a sliver of the industry that employs nearly half a million people in Pennsylvania and contributes $185 billion to our economy each year.

Special thanks to Congressman G.T. Thompson, my colleague from Pennsylvania, who is vice chair of the ag committee who conducted a listening session with other members of the Pennsylvania delegation, as well as members of the ag committee. I was very pleased to welcome to Pennsylvania ROGER MARSHALL from Kansas and Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON. It was a great session with many members of the ag community from across Pennsylvania.

I also would like to thank Farm Show Executive Director Sharon Attkland for once again putting on a fantastic show. I also thank PA Ag Secretary Redding and U.S. Department of Agriculture Under Secretary Gregabic for attending and participating in the listening session as well. Once again, fabulous show. I look forward to attending again next year.

RECOGNIZING HEATHER RICHARDSON-BERGSHA

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize High Point native Heather Richardson-Bergsma for qualifying for the 2018 Winter Olympics in speed skating. Holding multiple world records, she will be competing for her first Olympic medal this year.

Heather’s hunger for speed skating began at an early age. Growing up just a few minutes from our local High Point roller rink, Heather’s talents were recognized by a local coach who suggested she start taking inline speed skating classes.

Although she was told she must wait a full year before she could compete, her passion and dedication for the sport did not waiver, and a year later she competed in her first race.

The Olympic medal is crowning achievements in every Olympian’s career. The many years, hours, minutes, and seconds they have devoted to training all come down to fulfilled dreams and broken records.

Heather’s dedication, passion, and perseverance demonstrate the characteristics found in every great athlete. I am proud to recognize Heather today and I wish her the best of luck next month.

RECOGNIZING JAVA SCOUTS ROBOTICS TEAM

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the JavaScouts, a youth robotics team from my hometown of New Hartford, New York.

In December, the JavaScouts competed in the regional qualifier for the FIRST Tech Challenge at Sauquoit High School, where they qualified for the regional championship in New York.

The JavaScouts also received the FIRST Tech Challenge Inspire Award, which is presented to the team that judges feel act as a positive role model to other teams and embraced the challenge of this program.

I would like to extend my congratulations to the JavaScouts team personally: Keegan Birt, Liam Evans, Kyle Grover, Ari Sprague, Kyle Tuttle, Jimi Wadnola, and Leon Zeng.

I wish the JavaScouts continued success as they move forward to the regional championship. I take great pride and it is a great honor in representing these young constituents who place such an emphasis on determination, ingenuity, and education in achieving these many worthy goals.

CONGRESSIONAL APP CHALLENGE WINNERS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the winning team for the 2017 Congressional App Challenge for the First District of Georgia: Cole Goldhill, Luca Dichiara, Joseph Kim, and Ryan Cranford. Over the last 4 months, 190 Members of Congress hosted the Congressional App Challenge in their districts, where students compete to code original apps. 4,100 students participated, submitting over 1,000 original apps.

The winning team in Georgia’s First Congressional District is from Richmond Hill Middle School and created the app, “Wing Finder.” This app enables individuals who enjoy viewing butterflies to find more information about those butterflies, comparing their wing colors to a database containing numerous facts about them.

I am proud of these students in Richmond Hill for doing such a great job coding and creating this app. Seeing what these students can achieve
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to address the House this afternoon.

Beginning in 2013, I began discussing how our economic recovery was subpar in comparison to post-World War II recoveries. That is, in part, due to, as I argued, the wet blanket of the avalanche of new regulatory costs imposed by the previous administration.

Since Congress has a poor track record of regularly enacting all of our appropriations bills, funding the government, and directing agency priorities, the administrative state, that unelected portion of our government, has expanded in authority and filled that void.

The House turned a corner this year, Mr. Speaker, by passing all 12 spending bills, fully vetted through our committees, as of September 30, 2017. Sadly, only the first time since 2010. Further, it has been more than 21 years since Congress has passed all 12 funding bills and had them signed into law before the start of a new fiscal year.

Likewise, the Supreme Court, in their case, Chevron U.S.A. v. the Natural Resources Defense Council, back in 1984, set up a concept now referred to as the "Chevron deference." This, too, has empowered the unelected, Big Government agencies to defer to their authority, rather than the People's Congress. This has further emasculated the Article I powers of the Constitution. I disagree with this concept of Chevron deference. Before he died, Justice Scalia regretted his defense of Chevron deference and said that it, in fact, "contravened separation of powers."

This combination of the Chevron deference and the lack of the regular, predictable oversight and appointments have resulted in this wet blanket of a growing leviathan of a centralized Federal power, negating State authorities protected under the 10th Amendment and curbing freedom for our families and individuals.

Noted New York lawyer and author, Philip Howard, calls this "The Rule of Nobody." In the 2014 book, Howard argues that our administrative state is wearing people out. The process is devoid of human judgment and common sense.

Many of us, in the Congress, are pushing back, insisting, like in the VA Accountability Act, that—a shocking idea—bad employees should be fired and, through the public oversight of our committees or in my own Golden Fleece Awards, that we demand accountability of the personnel of the Federal Government and commonsense in the application of our policies.

Howard retired the U.S. Open golf championship back in 2011, out in Bethesda, Maryland, when county officials shut down a children's lemonade stand near the course because it didn't have a vendor's license, Mr. Speaker. This approach is not limited just to the beltway's Federal mandates.

So enters President Trump, our new President. Last year, I wrote then-President-elect Trump asking him to create a regulatory relief task force to address the overly burdensome regulations from our Federal agencies that, in my view, have hurt, over the past decade, our economic growth, our job growth, our productivity, and, hence, our wage growth.

In February of 2017, President Trump ordered Federal agencies to create a regulatory reform task force to identify rules within their agency that needed elimination or modification. I rise today to recognize the improvements in the regulatory process in the past year and the significant reductions in cost to the economy, as a result, and I commend the new administration for seeking to continue this momentum into 2018, with the recent release of its regulatory plan and agenda for 2018.

As Phil Howard has demonstrated, and we experience daily, the Federal administrative state is lacking in accountability. It is not just vast and costly; it is unnecessarily intrusive into the everyday lives of hardworking Americans.

In Arkansas, we have seen agency regulations that have had devastating economic impacts on our farmers, small businesses, nonprofits, schools, colleges, universities, and State agencies.

President Trump set the proper tone for reining in this regulatory state by issuing an executive order, in the first 10 days of taking office, directing agencies to eliminate two existing regulations for each new one issued. Common sense.

In 2017, Federal agencies have withdrawn or delayed 1,579 planned regulatory actions, leading to over $8 billion in lifetime net cost savings.

In 2018, the Trump administration plans to raise the bar by issuing 448 de-regulatory actions and 131 regulatory actions, a better than 3 to 1 ratio, resulting in more than $9 billion in lifetime cost savings for the economy.

This chart shows the annual cost of new regulations reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget every year, beginning in 2009. You can see the wet blanket that I described growing between 2009 and 2012. But you can see, in the last column, 2017, that there is actually a decline: a $570 million reduction in the cost of new regulations proposed by Washington.

During 2017, here in Congress, we have passed 13 congressional review acts, 11 of which President Trump signed into law this year. By repealing these 11 damaging, large rules, the economy will save some $10 billion over the next 20 years.

These savings and cuts put the control back in the hands of the American people and ensure more accountability and much-needed transparency to the rulemaking process is assured, while providing that local businesses, local farmers, and communities have relief.

Also, we are working with the administration to rightsize regulatory costs through the use of cost-benefit analysis and asserting our Article I oversight authority. Thus, Congress is working, through our committee process, also, to lower and remove the costs and burden of that wet blanket of an overburdened regulatory state.

Naturally, this cost benefit work must be done responsibly by balancing labor and capital, clean air and water, energy security, clean energy, future safe banks, and protected consumers. All that is the responsibility of our elected Members in the House and Senate and their oversight of the executive branch.

I commend President Trump for cutting the red tape in Washington and giving control back to our States, local communities, and hardworking taxpayers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise, today, to discuss my recent resolution here in the House, H. Res. 673, which expresses concern over attacks on Coptic Christians in Egypt.

I had the opportunity to travel to Egypt last year. In the course of preparing for that trip, and during the trip, as well as after I returned back to the United States, I repeatedly heard about the plight of Coptic Christians in Egypt.

ISIS named the Copts their number one target, and we all know their brutal atrocities against them.

In Libya, back in 2015, ISIS beheaded 21 Coptic Christians, sending shock waves from that photo around the world.

Scores were killed in the bombings of St. Peter and St. Paul’s Church in Cairo, in December 2016. Most recently, on December 29, 11 were shot and killed outside of Saint Menas Church in Helwan.

These are just a few of the atrocities carried out against Copts by terrorist groups like ISIS.

I had the opportunity to walk the halls of the St. Peter and St. Paul Cathedral. I reflected on the Gospel of Matthew, when Mary fled to Egypt with baby Jesus to save him from King Herod. The Copts are the Egyptians. In fact, the word “Coptic” in Greek means Egyptian.

But there in St. Peter and St. Paul’s beautiful cathedral in Cairo, murdered by a coward, as women and children prayed, blood splattered on the walls...
marked the horror and chaos of that place of worship and serenity. Although Coptic Christians have repeatedly been victims of numerous attacks from terrorist groups and extremists, it has been most disturbing to me to learn of the attacks carried out against Coptic and Christian churches that are carried out by their fellow Egyptians.

On December 22, 2017, just after Friday prayers, dozens of Egyptian Muslims, pilgrims en route to a Coptic Christian church south of Cairo in an act that started out as a demonstration. While unsanctioned by the Egyptian Government, this church had been holding services for some 15 years.

According to reports, the individuals called for the church's demolition, destroyed its contents, and assaulted those worshipping inside. Based on similar attacks, it is unlikely, Mr. Speaker, that the Egyptian Government will hold those perpetrators accountable for their despicable actions.

This is just the most recent example of the ongoing trend of assaults on Copts, their churches, and their property. I believe that many of us in Congress were pleased to see Egyptian President el-Sisi join Coptic Pope Tawadros II in participating in last Saturday's Orthodox Christmas mass at the recently opened Nativity of Christ Cathedral in Egypt's new administrative capital east of Cairo.

President el-Sisi's words of tolerance and hope are appreciated by all those who respect peace for all those who live in Egypt and all who favor religious freedom across the globe.

However, while President el-Sisi spoke words of tolerance, there are, in my view, greater actions that both he and the Egyptian Government can take to protect the rights of Egyptian Christians seeking merely to raise their families, pursue their work, respect their leaders, and love their ancient nation.

For this reason, I introduced H. Res. 673 to urge continued progress in religious tolerance in this very important country. There are many constructive steps that will enhance tolerance, provide better security for Christians, and improve the education and opportunities for all Egyptians.

My colleagues and I offer this resolution in the sanctity of our long friendship and partnership with Egypt. We are partners in regional peace efforts, regional economic growth, and in our mutual desire to defeat militant terrorist groups and nations and those who finance them.

President el-Sisi has set the right tone at the top level of his government, and I believe he has a respectful partnership with the leadership of the Copts and other Christians in Egypt.

But this respect and the resulting legal protections must be passed down to all levels of government and society because the streets, sadly, tell a different story.

The Egyptian people are a proud people, with an extraordinary civilization, and I believe this is a great opportunity for Egypt to emphasize the importance that Copts can play in Egyptian society as full Egyptian citizens.

As Coptic Pope Tawadros II told me on my visit to Cairo, all Egyptians—Muslim and Christian—take their water from the Nile.

Egypt is an essential partner in the efforts toward a lasting peace between Israel and her neighbors and in the fight against terrorism and violent extremism.

President el-Sisi told me on two occasions how important counterterrorism is to the Egyptian Government. It is their number one concern, without any doubt, and I commend the President for his partnership with the United States, and especially with Israel, in the field of counterterrorism.

With ISIS carrying out two terrorist attacks last year in Egypt within a month of each, in November and December, in the Sinai and in Egypt, the Egyptian Government's concerns about terrorism are legitimate and real.

However, in my view, I do not believe Egypt's march toward modernization and progress and focusing on counterterrorism should come at the cost of sacrificing advances in human rights, education, and religious freedom.

I urge swift consideration of my resolution by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and on the floor of the House so that we can continue to advance religious freedom and civil society with our partner, Egypt.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 8. An act to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit a report on filing requirements for the Universal Service Fund programs, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 12, 2018, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3676. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Financial Stability Oversight Council 2016 annual report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5322(a)(2)(N); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 112(a)(2)(N); (124 Stat. 1396); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3677. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received December 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3678. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (Regulation C) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received December 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3681. A letter from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's report to Congress on credit card agreements, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1637(p)(3); Public Law 90-321, Sec. 127 (as amended by Public Law 111-24, Sec. 301(1)); (123 Stat. 1756); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3682. A letter from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's report to Congress on the impact of the Credit Card Accountability, Responsibility, and Disclosure Act of 2009, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1637(d); Public Law 111-24, Sec. 502(a); (123 Stat. 1756); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3683. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AE58) January 4, 2018, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3684. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's technical corrections — 18-Month Extension of Transition Period and Delay of Applicability Dates; Best Interest Contract Exemption (PTE 2016-01); Class Exemption for Principal Transacting in Certain Annuity Investment Advice Fiduciaries and Employee Benefit Plans and IRAs (PTE 2016-02); Prohibited Transactions Involving Insurance Agents and Brokers, Pension Consultants, Insurance Companies, and Investment Company Principal Underwriters (PTE 84-24); Correction (Application Number: D-11712; D-11718; D-11850) (RIN: 2120-ZA27) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3685. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement Age received January 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3686. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Missing Participants (RIN: 1210-ZA27) received January 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3687. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation
Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DeFazio (for himself, Mr. Capuano, Ms. Clarke of Massachusetts, Ms. DeLauro, Ms. Eshoo of Connecticut, Mr. Himes, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kennedy of Georgia, Mr. Carpenter of New Hampshire, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Lynch, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Moakley, Mr. Neal, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Poliquin, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Welch, and Mr. Poliquin):

H.R. 4771. A bill to prohibit oil and gas leasing on the outer Continental Shelf of the coast of New England; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. Connolly (for himself, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Hoey, Mr. Norton, Mr. Beery, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Clay, Mr. Yarmuth, Ms. Kaptur, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mr. Sherman, Ms. Comstock, Ms. McCollum, Mr. Kilmer, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Delaney, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Courtney, Mr. McGovern, Ms. Slaughter, and Mr. Shays):

H.R. 4775. A bill to increase the rates of pay for the statistical and prevailing rate employees by 3 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. Dingell:

H.R. 4776. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program of partnerships for State and regional hospital preparedness and response capacity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. Frankel of Florida (for herself, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Poe of Texas, and Mr. Himes):

H.R. 4777. A bill to amend section 214(c)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the data reporting requirements relating to nonimmigrant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Kennedy (for himself, Ms. Matsui, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, Mr. Engel, Ms. Schakowsky, Mrs. Dingell, and Mr. Rush):

H.R. 4778. A bill to strengthen parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. Lee (for herself, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Young of Alaska, Mr. Poliquin, and Ms. Titus):

H.R. 4779. A bill to prohibit States and individuals in States that have laws which permit the use of marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MacArthur (for himself, Mr. Rooney of Illinois, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Garrett, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Moorey of New Mexico, Mr. Bacon, and Mr. Stivers):

H.R. 4780. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make available an online tax service to estimate a taxpayer's individual income tax liability with respect to the amendments made by the Tax Cuts and...
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Jobs Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Mrs. NOEM:
H.R. 4761. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land to Custer County, South Dakota; to the Committee on Natural Resources.
By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. SOTO):
H.R. 4764. A bill to provide additional disaster recovery assistance for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Education and the Workforce, the Budget, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. JONES):
H.R. 4765. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to improve the scheduling of appointments, the accountability of third party administrators, the capacity to provide services under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.
By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON Lee, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GARAMendi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. Watson-COLEMAN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEeks, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRIISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MCGovern, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BARBERÁN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):
H.R. 4764. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide funding for American Health Benefit Exchange programs and other prevention and promotional activities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
By Mr. NUNES:
H.Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 339; considered and agreed to.
By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr. GARAMendi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JAYAPAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. GABHARD, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):
H.Res. 686. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of Korean American Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.
By Mr. BILIRAKIS:
H.Res. 687. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Federal, State, and local taxes, fees, regulations, and permitting policies should be coordinated and reconciled to maximize the benefits of broadband investment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. FALLONE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):
H.Res. 688. A resolution honoring Mark E. Miller for his distinguished public service and professional assistance to the United States Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
By Mr. HUDSON:
H.Res. 689. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any infrastructure legislation that provides federal funds to wireless broadband providers to promote wireless broadband deployment should prioritize funds for wireless broadband providers in States that have enacted streamlined siting requirements for small cells; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
By Mr. LANCE:
H.Res. 690. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that no Federal funds granted, awarded, or loaned pursuant to any legislation, infrastructure specific or otherwise, should be used to fund the construction, improvement, or acquisition of broadband facilities or service areas where there is an existing broadband provider that meets certain minimum standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
By Mr. LATTA:
H.Res. 691. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any infrastructure legislation to promote broadband internet access or communications facilities deployment should treat all broadband and communications facilities in a technology- and technologically neutral manner; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT
Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.
By Mr. DEFAZIO:
H.R. 4766. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.
By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 4767. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:
H.R. 4768. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause, Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the Foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mr. MARINO:
H.R. 4769. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.
By Mrs. LOVE:
H.R. 4770. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.
By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 4773. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution which states “Congress shall have the Power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.”
By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan:
H.R. 4772. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.
By Mr. BRADY of Tennessee:
H.R. 4774. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution which states “Congress shall have the Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the following Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”
By Mr. CICILLINE:
H.R. 4776. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. CONNOLLY:
H.R. 4775. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mrs. DINGELL:
H.R. 4776. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:
H.R. 4777. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 4778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 4779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 4780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 200: Mr. Graves of Louisiana, Mr. Babin, and Mr. Higgins of Louisiana.
H.R. 219: Mr. Sablan.
H.R. 659: Mr. Luetkemeyer.
H.R. 667: Mr. Fleischmann, Mr. Blum, and Mr. Smith of New Jersey.
H.R. 848: Mr. Pearce.
H.R. 856: Mrs. Weber of Texas, Mrs. McMorris Rodgers, Ms. Roskam, Mr. Woodall, Mr. Conaway, and Mr. Bergman.
H.R. 1316: Mrs. Beatty and Mrs. Hartzler.
H.R. 1419: Mr. Blum.
H.R. 1456: Mrs. Walorski and Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico.
H.R. 1556: Mr. Luetkemeyer.
H.R. 1626: Mrs. Blackburn.
H.R. 1676: Mr. Levin.
H.R. 1683: Mr. Bacon.
H.R. 2166: Mr. Jones.
H.R. 2542: Ms. Shea-Porter.
H.R. 2561: Mr. Garey, Mr. Palazzo, Mr. Collins of Georgia, Mr. Donovan, Mrs. Nuel, Mr. Knight, and Mr. Luetkemeyer.
H.R. 2719: Ms. Tsongas.
H.R. 2746: Mrs. Rowdy.
H.R. 2748: Mr. Ruphus and Mr. Palazzo.
H.R. 3240: Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3397: Mr. Larsen of Washington.
H.R. 3398: Mr. Womack.
H.R. 3444: Mr. Serban, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, and Ms. Loebsack.
H.R. 3547: Mr. Poe of Texas.
H.R. 3637: Mr. Kildee.
H.R. 3773: Mr. Thompson of Mississippi.
H.R. 3826: Ms. Matsui.
H.R. 3875: Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3881: Ms. Velázquez and Mr. Jayapal.
H.R. 4007: Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Breyer, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Mrs. Demings, Ms. Espaillat, Ms. Fudge, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Loebsack, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Ms. Royal-Aldar, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Takano, and Ms. Plaskett.
H.R. 4022: Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, and Mr. Rouzer.
H.R. 4044: Mr. Guthrie.
H.R. 4226: Mr. Joes, and Mr. Carfrae.
H.R. 4097: Mr. Welch and Ms. Judy Chu of California.
H.R. 4207: Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4210: Mrs. Black.
H.R. 4238: Mr. Joes.
H.R. 4238: Ms. Watson Coleman, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, and Mr. Engel.
H.R. 4270: Mr. Wolf, Mr. Huizenga, and Mr. Rokita.
H.R. 4318: Mr. Gianforte and Mr. Costa.
H.R. 4392: Ms. Adams and Ms. Sánchez.
H.R. 4410: Mrs. Beatty.
H.R. 4424: Mr. King of Iowa.
H.R. 4475: Mr. Blumenauer.
H.R. 4482: Mr. Budd.
H.R. 4506: Mr. Brat.
H.R. 4548: Mrs. Beatty.
H.R. 4561: Mr. Moultun and Mr. McEachin.
H.R. 4638: Ms. Rice of New York.
H.R. 4637: Mr. Bishop of Georgia.
H.R. 4664: Mr. Harris.
H.R. 4666: Mrs. McMorris Rodgers.
H.R. 4706: Mr. Donovan and Mr. Deutch.
H.R. 4712: Mr. Estes of Kansas, Mr. Thomas J. Rooney of Florida, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Carter of Georgia, and Mr. McKinley.
H.R. 4725: Ms. Sewell of Alabama.
H.R. 4744: Mr. Meihan and Mr. King of New York.
H.R. 4760: Mr. Flores, Mr. McKinley, Mr. Nornan, Mr. Smith of Texas, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Marino, Mr. Rutherford, and Mr. Buck.
H.R. 4793: Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Conaway, Mr. Shimkus, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Barr, Mr. Wittman, Mr. Flores, Mr. Rothfus, Mr. Harris, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Huizenga, Mr. Poe of Texas, Mr. Jody B. Rice of Georgia, Mr. Sierra, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Donovan.
The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, in whose hand lies the destiny of people and nations, empower our lawmakers to do Your will on Earth even as it is done in Heaven. Make their lives reflect gratitude for Your merciful kindness and loving providence. Lord, break the bonds of any excessive self-sufficiency by showing them what they can accomplish with Your supernatural strength. Help them to be blessings and not burdens as they live a life with the gifts of enthusiasm and expectancy. As they live at full potential according to Your expectations, use them to glorify Your Name on the Earth.

We pray in Your great 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. Rounds). The majority leader is recognized.

**TAX REFORM**
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, anyone who has read the news lately will have come across some pretty remarkable headlines about the state of the U.S. economy.

On Tuesday, Gallup announced that at the close of 2017, Americans’ optimism about the job market set a new record. The same day, the S&P 500 hit an all-time high. Last week, the New York Times ran a story about “a wave of optimism [that] has swept over American business leaders.” This optimism, the reporters continued, “is beginning to translate into the sort of investments in new plants, equipment and factory upgrades that bolsters economic growth, spurs job creation—and may finally raise wages significantly.” Markets are optimistic, manufacturers are optimistic, and workers are optimistic. Investment is ramping up, wages are growing, and unemployment is low. By all accounts, 2018 is off to a very bright start.

Of course, Washington is not the source of all this. The engine of American free enterprise is not here in the Nation’s Capital, it is in the ingenuity, talent, and work ethic of workers and entrepreneurs all across our country.

Government does not create prosperity, the American people do, but the Federal Government can certainly get in the way. Draconian tax policy and runaway regulation make it more difficult for American workers to find jobs and get pay raises. It becomes harder to start new businesses, harder to expand and invest in existing businesses, and more tempting to send money and jobs overseas.

During the Obama years, that is precisely what happened. For 8 years, his administration seized every single opportunity it could find to increase taxes, pile on more regulations, and literally micromanage the lives of the American people. Many middle-class families, like the ones I represent in Kentucky, were drowning in all this.

Now all of that is changing. In 2017, a Republican President, Republican House, and Republican Senate brought back bedrock, free market principles: tax less, regulate less, micromanage less, and empower the American people to work hard and keep more of what they earn. And we are already seeing results.

The most significant accomplishment was the historic tax reform law the President signed into law just over 3 weeks ago. It hadn’t been done in 30 years, but in 2017 Congress and the White House worked together to overhaul the Tax Code. We cut rates for families and businesses, expanded key deductions, closed wasteful loopholes, and repealed ObamaCare’s individual mandate tax. We took a lot of money out of Washington’s pocket and put it back in the pockets of middle-class families, who, after all, earned it in the first place.

Earlier in the year, we made major progress in rolling back the tangled web of Obama-era red tape using the Congressional Review Act. Congress repealed 15 major Federal regulations that were literally stifling American enterprise. This alone is expected to save employers up to $35 billion in compliance costs. This was in addition to the 860 obsolete rules the Trump administration revisited in 2017.

Small businesses and large companies are all benefitting from these victories, and so are their workers. Boeing has announced plans to invest $100 million in developing its workforce and another $100 million to enhance its facilities and infrastructure. AT&T intends to invest a billion dollars in capital upgrades. Just this morning, Walmart announced it would raise starting wages for hourly associates, along with bonuses and an expansion of paid family leave. That is great news for more than 1 million people, including the nearly 30,000 people working at more than 100 Walmart stores across my home State of Kentucky. This is in addition to all of the other employers across the State who have already begun passing tax reform savings along to their employees.

What is true for nationwide employers is proving to be true on Main Streets across the country as well. In
New Jersey a family-owned car dealership is giving each of its full-time employees a $500 bonus and looking to create more jobs. In Florida, a family-owned cookie bakery is planning to immediately expense new equipment purchased by doubling their production and boosting pay for their team. All told, more than 100 companies have announced intentions to deliver special bonuses, pay increases, or other benefits to employees as a result of tax reform. This in addition to the direct savings from tax cuts. Thanks to lower rates and bigger deductions, American workers will get to keep more of their paychecks.

These are just a few of the ways a growth in American incomes can make life better for the American people. This is what happens when a Republican President and Republican majorities in Congress work to get Washington out of the way.

It is a shame that none of our Democratic colleagues in the House or the Senate—not one, not a single one—voted for tax reform—not a one. If they had their way, American businesses would not have had a 21st century tax code giving them a fairer fight with overseas rivals. American workers wouldn’t have these bonuses and special benefits, and a typical family of four earning just over $70,000 wouldn’t be on track to keep $2,000 more of their own money this year.

Fortunately, Republican majorities passed the bill anyway, and the American people are sure glad that we did. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will 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.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we are inching ever closer to the government’s spending deadline of January 19, when we will have to address a host of unresolved issues that must lift the spending caps equally for defense and other domestic priorities, such as opioids, veterans, pensions. We must pass an aid package to give relief to disaster-stricken areas of our country. We must pass the healthcare package that extends CHIP—a vital health insurance—and community health centers.

Just this week, the CBO projected that CHIP will actually save the government money if it is extended for 10 years. We could ensure that kids continue to have health insurance for longer and save the government money if we extend it for 10 years. That is a no-brainer.

Of course, we must settle the fate of the Dreamers. A deal to pass DACA protection alongside a package of border security measures is finally within reach. As the immigration meeting at the White House showed, almost everyone in this body is interested in passing DACA protection. Democrats are interested in effective, practical border security measures. We want what secures the border the most, not what sounds the best, not that it was a political slogan in a campaign, but that it actually meets our common border as drugs flow in and other things come across. We are working as hard as we can to find an agreement both sides can live with. The only folks who didn’t get the memo were some House Republicans who continue to push hard-line immigration bills that are outside the scope of the negotiations. I am referring to Representative GOODLATTE’s proposal, which is entirely counterproductive and completely unnecessary.

If Speaker RYAN is going to listen to the hard right in the House and coalesce behind Representative GOODLATTE’s proposal on DACA, we will have no deal. Let the American people and their representatives know that we are not going to resist Representative GOODLATTE’s proposal—he has never been for Dream to begin with—we will have no deal.

If Speaker RYAN bends to the hard-right faction of his caucus—which is far away from what most Americans think; the hard right doesn’t like Dreamers, and 70 percent of Americans do—and if they ask for immigration measures outside the scope of our negotiations, then so will we. Deal with chain migration outside of the scope of Dreamers? Let’s deal with the 11 million who need a path to citizenship—a tough but fair path. We can play that game too. We can go beyond the confines of this deal, which has been hard on the Dreamers, and then the whole thing won’t happen.

There are people on my side who aren’t going to want to make any compromises. I know that. There are people on both sides who won’t want to make any compromises. As responsible leaders, we have to come to an agreement, and we can’t make everybody happy. That is why we have a House and Senate. That is why we have legislators.

The whole reason we narrowed the scope of our negotiations is so that we could accomplish something for the Dreamers, rather than retitulating comprehensive immigration reform in such a compressed timeframe.

This body passed a very fine bill, in my opinion. It was really tough on the hard right. That was a no-brainer. And we are stuck. That hurts everybody.

I am sure my good friend is hearing from farmers in his State, as I hear from farmers in mine, and businessmen. We have to tighten up our borders. We have to make sure we have a rational system of immigration. We can’t assure that every person who wants to come here comes here. We all agree with that. But that is comprehensive immigration reform, because we also believe that the 11 million here should be given a difficult but fair path to citizenship. We can’t start litigating all of that.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle say: I have to have this provision outside DACA and border security. They are hurting the cause of getting something done.

If we can reach an agreement by the end of this week or over the weekend, we can pass it into law as part of a government deal on the 19th. I believe that is still the best way to resolve the issue. I am hopeful we can get this done. Any later than that, we won’t have time to do it by the 19th.

Let me assure my colleagues, accept the dreamers, respect their identity. It is a shame that none of our Democratic colleagues in the House or the Senate—not one, not a single one—voted for tax reform—not a one. The Speaker in good faith—their intention is to put a bill on the floor in February or March. We have heard that before, and it never happens. So we feel passionately that we should get this done both tight up the border and help the Dreamers. We have to do it as part of the must-pass bill, and that must-pass bill is this global spending deal.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now a word on the Russia investigation. Over the past weeks, several events have shaken my confidence that our Republican colleagues are committed to an independent investigation in Congress and at the FBI.

A rightwing smear campaign is being waged to discredit the investigation and the investigator. Absurd attacks have been launched on Special Counsel Mueller, one of the finest men that I think we have ever come across in this body. I remember when he was FBI Director; everyone loved him. He is a man of utmost integrity. A Republican congressman went so far as to suggest his investigation was a “coup” when that Member spoke on the floor of the House.

Here in the Senate, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee—I have great respect for him: we are the only two Charles E’s in the Senate—referred Christopher Steele to the FBI and recommended criminal charges, even though Mr. Steele was a whistleblower—something that our chairman of Judiciary has always protected. He called Mr. Steele a patriot and the FBI. Donald Trump was subject to blackmail. Any American would worry about that. The chairman took that action...
unilaterally—that is, asking for criminal charges—without consulting with or providing notice to the minority. Yet he still expressed outrage when the ranking member of his committee released a transcript of his committee’s interview with the Chair of Fusion GPS that he wrote the same report. There is a fundamental double standard here. You can’t complain, Mr. Chairman of Judiciary, about our side doing things unilaterally if you do them unilaterally. We want bipartisanship when it suits us.

I applaud my friend, the senior Senator from California, for releasing that transcript. It contained information that was crucial for the American people to read and understand in order to judge for themselves the allegations my friends across the aisle have made. You make a serious allegation against someone but say no one can see the information? That is not fair. That is not how we work here in America.

Now, in the Foreign Relations Committee, my friend Senator CARDIN was compelled to release a minority report about Russia’s interference in foreign elections because the majority would not join him. Think about that. Senator CARDIN’s report showed something we already knew to be true—no one disputes that; well, maybe a few—that Russia maliciously and persistently interferes in elections around the globe and will not cease without unified and strong evidence.

Senator CARDIN’s report is another compelling reason that the Senate act on election security legislation. Before we left for the holidays, Senators LANKFORD, KLOBuchar, HARRIS, and COLLINS introduced the Secure Elections Act. It is a good piece of legislation that would help shore up election security. Midterm elections are just around the corner, and, as Senator CARDIN’s report tells us, Russia will no doubt use every opportunity to sow confusion and chaos into our democracy once again. That is what they do. That is what Putin likes to do. We have to stop it. And making information public about it is very important. This should be a unifying, nonpartisan issue.

Why would the Republican majority on the Foreign Relations Committee refuse to join that report? It is because—in my judgment, at least—for partisan reasons, Republicans in Congress, some parts of the media—the conservative parts of the media—have sought to undermine the Russia investigation in countless ways. They have hidden behind secrecy and innuendo to cast aspersions on the investigation and erect roadblocks in its path. Their goal, it seems, is to discredit the investigation so that ultimately they can discredit any findings that are detrimental to their party or their President.

President Trump makes the strategy manifest, clear as day, almost every day on his Twitter feed. Yesterday, he tweeted that the Russia investigation was “the single greatest witch hunt in American history.” That is a little self-centered. How about Salem? Those people were burned at the stake. And he wrote that “Republicans should finally take control.” That last line should send shivers down our spines, that “Republicans should finally take control” of the investigation. From the very beginning, this investigation has been about an issue most sensitive to our national interests—interference in our elections, the wellspring and pride of our wonderful and great and grand democracy. If ever there were an issue that transcends partisan reasons, Republicans in Congress should join us in investigating it. After all, this is where we are. Republican lawmakers ought to shout down that kind of appeal. We all must commit to the essential truth of the matter, which is that the investigation into Russian interference in our election must remain as bipartisan and as nonpartisan as possible. The interests of the Nation are at stake. All of us—all of us—must choose country over party.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS DAY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today is National Human Trafficking Awareness Day. Montana, like much of the United States, is suffering from the rise in human trafficking. I am grateful that Montana’s attorney general, Tim Fox, has taken this issue head-on. In fact, Montana has had three times the number of human trafficking cases in 2017 as we had in 2015—a threefold increase. Unfortunately, this number will likely continue to rise in the coming years, and online platforms are a driving force for it. Like so many things, the Internet has tremendous power for good as well as for evil.

Having spent 12 years building a startup cloud computing business in my hometown of Bozeman—a business that does not even exist anymore—we took the company public. This became a large, global business. I understand the power of the Internet for good. But I also believe we must and can have better safeguards to protect our children, our families, and our neighbors from sex trafficking, while at the same time protecting innovation on the Internet.

Unfortunately, a startup business—your business—has the potential to be used for terrible reasons without your awareness. Even more upsetting, it is also possible that online platforms do not know that bad actors are using that platform and they do nothing about it. During my first hearing on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, we investigated one of these platforms: backpage.com.

Bad actors like backpage.com must be held accountable. That is why today, on Human Trafficking Awareness Day, I will be joining the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act. This act strips protections for platforms that knowingly assist, support, or facilitate sex trafficking. We must take steps now to stop human trafficking and protect vulnerable members of our community. The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act moves us closer to that goal.

I tip my hat and I am thankful to Senator PORTMAN for introducing this bill. I am thankful for the work of the Senate Commerce Committee to ensure that this legislation protects the millions of companies on the Internet that are building our economy and creating high-paying jobs and doing so in good faith.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor for S. 1693, the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I am grateful for the work of the Senate Commerce Committee to ensure that this legislation protects the millions of companies on the Internet that are building our economy and creating high-paying jobs and doing so in good faith.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I am grateful for the work of the Senate Commerce Committee to ensure that this legislation protects the millions of companies on the Internet that are building our economy and creating high-paying jobs and doing so in good faith.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I am grateful for the work of the Senate Commerce Committee to ensure that this legislation protects the millions of companies on the Internet that are building our economy and creating high-paying jobs and doing so in good faith.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I am grateful for the work of the Senate Commerce Committee to ensure that this legislation protects the millions of companies on the Internet that are building our economy and creating high-paying jobs and doing so in good faith.
do that any longer due to the increased Federal regulators’ crackdown on mortgage lending.

As a member of the Senate who cares deeply about rural America and the special way of life we enjoy in Kansas, this is a very damaging occurrence. If a community bank or lender says they can no longer extend credit to what would otherwise have been a credit-worthy borrower because of the fear of making a mistake and the repercussions that follow, then they decide not to make the loan at all and not even to be in the business. What community would expect their financial institutions in their community to refuse to make a home loan? It is the American dream.

While community banks had been consolidating for a number of years due to shifting demographics and market conditions, we cannot nor should we attempt to discount the role the post-Dodd-Frank regulatory environment has had in the harm of our community banking structure. The overwhelming response I received is that the costs associated with complying with new Federal regulations are simply too much to absorb in their business model.

Community banks in Kansas are losing their hometown banks to consolidation and sales, and some of these banks that are making money and said by some to be in great condition are losing the family owned for generations. In order to better understand why these lenders are consolidating or selling, I have sought out the nature of this decline by speaking with financial leaders from across the country. The responsiveness from lenders has been significant financial downturn, a new regulatory framework was put in place to rein in those bad actors and punish bad behavior that led us down that path in 2007 and 2008. We have had more than 7 years to determine what the effects are of this new regulatory environment—Dodd-Frank—and what it has meant to our community banks and our community financial institutions. The most glaring aspect of these new regulations is the disproportionate burden placed upon those smaller institutions seeking to comply with their new responsibilities.

Rather than extending credit to best fit the needs of their customers, banks are either flat out of business or turning away because the penalties for making a mistake far outweigh the economic benefits derived from extending a loan. I experienced this damaging news and reality during the Senate Banking Committee’s consideration of legislation to reform the secondary mortgage markets in 2014. I was attempting to solicit feedback from Kansas lenders of the financial impact some of these proposed changes would have on their communities, and what I learned, unfortunately, did not make sense to them anymore.” When pressed for a reason, they responded it just didn’t make business sense for them to that impact some of these regulatory changes would have on their communities.

As a member of the Senate who cares deeply about rural America and the special way of life we enjoy in Kansas, this is a very damaging occurrence. If a community bank or lender says they can no longer extend credit to what would otherwise have been a credit-worthy borrower because of the fear of making a mistake and the repercussions that follow, then they decide not to make the loan at all and not even to be in the business. What community would expect their financial institutions in their community to refuse to make a home loan? It is the American dream.

While community banks had been consolidating for a number of years due to shifting demographics and market conditions, we cannot nor should we attempt to discount the role the post-Dodd-Frank regulatory environment has had in the harm of our community banking structure. The overwhelming response I received is that the costs associated with complying with new Federal regulations are simply too much to absorb in their business model.

In the aftermath of our country’s significant financial downturn, a new regulatory framework was put in place to rein in those bad actors and punish bad behavior that led us down that path in 2007 and 2008. We have had more than 7 years to determine what the effects are of this new regulatory environment—Dodd-Frank—and what it has meant to our community banks and our community financial institutions. The most glaring aspect of these new regulations is the disproportionate burden placed upon those smaller institutions seeking to comply with their new responsibilities.

Rather than extending credit to best fit the needs of their customers, banks are either flat out of business or turning away because the penalties for making a mistake far outweigh the economic benefits derived from extending a loan. I experienced this damaging news and reality during the Senate Banking Committee’s consideration of legislation to reform the secondary mortgage markets in 2014. I was attempting to solicit feedback from Kansas lenders of the financial impact some of these proposed changes would have on their communities, and what I learned, unfortunately, did not make sense to them anymore.” When pressed for a reason, they responded it just didn’t make business sense for them to
short period of time. Over the past 2 years, not counting what we hope to do this year, the committee has increased opioid funding by over $900 million, nearly a 200-percent increase for the Department of Health and Human Services—money for justice, more money for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This funding is focused on developing alternatives for pain management, giving our State, Federal, and local law enforcement partners the tools they need to combat opioid trafficking, ensuring first responders we are working to see that there are better ways to respond with opioid reversal.

One of the things we have seen recently is that opioids of all kinds are now laced with new drugs like fentanyl, and you don’t even know what you are taking. Naloxone, the former way to deal with this and still the most effective way to deal with this—you think you have dealt with a problem when in fact it is so strong the same person in just a few minutes lapses back into another seizure, attack, that has often been fatal. Even though people are there and the traditional way to respond is there, it isn’t enough for what is going on now.

One thing you would have to tell anybody doing this is, it is unlikely you have any real idea what you are putting into your system. What you think was a narcotic high the day before could easily kill you the next day. We have been looking for better ways to monitor programs so prescriptions in West Virginia and Missouri—they are both States where, in some counties, the number of prescriptions people have been walking into the pharmacist with are just ridiculous.

The committee that funds the Department of Health and Human Services—that is the committee we are both on—in the last 2 years, we have increased funding by just 13 times more than we were spending just 2 years ago. We have given grants to States, in ways we haven’t before, to look at specific State needs and ideas they have to deal with this and then share. We have looked at increasing Federal surveillance on how prescriptions are being written, how drug stores are becoming the conduit, and how many substances are coming through the mail to find new ways to do whether this is reasonable in the area these drugs are going into. We have looked at ways to increase the tools necessary to communities and first responders. We are talking right now to the National Institutes of Health about what they can do on a number of fronts. One is to work with the pharmaceutical companies themselves to develop alternatives to the kind of pain management we have had.

Also let me say on that front, we have gone through a period where doctors and hospitals were too often graded on whether people had any pain or not as opposed to whether they had pain they didn’t understand, pain that was unacceptable. More and more people ought to be saying, as opposed to taking this potentially addictive drug, give me a dose that is not as addictive, and maybe I am still more achy than I would have otherwise, but I understand it and am aware of it, and I am not in some cloud of no pain but not much of anything else in terms of real quality of life.

We are looking at how we can work with these companies for pain management. I have talked to the pharmaceutical companies. I think it is time for them to step up, maybe in partnership with NIH or some Federal money to encourage more private sector money to find alternatives that are less addictive and better understood, to find more effective and affordable ways to respond. Just the amount of money that we have committed, with NIH, is so powerful and so addictive that was unacceptable. More and more people ought to be saying, as opposed to giving me a dose that is not as addictive, maybe I am still more achy than I was unacceptable. More and more people ought to be saying, as opposed to giving me a dose that is not as addictive, maybe I am still more achy than I was.

We have to have a component of research that looks at the alternatives to pain medications and pain management.

The current bill we have looked at is $18 billion for programs to combat opioid abuse issues, and that is a 400-percent increase from the previous year.

In our State, there are large urban areas, but it also has a lot of small and remote communities and, frankly, rural communities have been hit particularly hard by this crisis. Certainly, West Virginia is a State that understands this. There has been no more advocacy or new ways to solve this problem than Senator CAPITO. I am glad to be here with her today as we talk about this issue.

I can assure the people we work for that this is a top priority. It has been a top priority for over 3 years now. The first 2 years showed dramatic increases in the willingness we had to deal with this and the breadth of how we deal with it, and that is one reason we need to move on and get this funding bill, which should have been done by October 1, done right now. As we get a new number to deal with, one of our priorities will be the opioid epidemic, and one of the leaders in that discussion will be the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BLUNT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senator BLUNT from the great State of Missouri for his leadership on this issue. He chairs the subcommittee that is very pivotal—the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services—and has moved forward so aggressively to up the funding in this area. We have the pedal to the metal now.

As he said, when we are moving and coming to a final spending bill, this has to be a top priority for us. It is absolutely critical. I am really pleased to be on the subcommittee, but I want to thank him for—I know he works diligently with NIH, which holds big promise. We are always looking for solutions. Can we treat ourselves out of this? Can we law enforce ourselves out of this? Can we prevent ourselves out of this? We need to do all of those. We have to have a component of research that looks at the alternatives to pain medications and pain management.

In our State, there are large urban areas, but it also has a lot of small and remote communities and, frankly, rural communities have been hit particularly hard by this crisis. Certainly, West Virginia is a State that understands this. There has been no more advocacy or new ways to solve this problem than Senator CAPITO. I am glad to be here with her today as we talk about this issue.

I can assure the people we work for that this is a top priority. It has been a top priority for over 3 years now. The first 2 years showed dramatic increases in the willingness we had to deal with this and the breadth of how we deal with it, and that is one reason we need to move on and get this funding bill, which should have been done by October 1, done right now. As we get a new number to deal with, one of our priorities will be the opioid epidemic, and one of the leaders in that discussion will be the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BLUNT.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senator BLUNT from the great State of Missouri for his leadership on this issue. He chairs the subcommittee that is very pivotal—the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services—and has moved forward so aggressively to up the funding in this area. We have the pedal to the metal now.

As he said, when we are moving and coming to a final spending bill, this has to be a top priority for us. It is absolutely critical. I am really pleased to be on the subcommittee, but I want to thank him for—I know he works diligently with NIH, which holds big promise. We are always looking for solutions. Can we treat ourselves out of this? Can we law enforce ourselves out of this? Can we prevent ourselves out of this? We need to do all of those. We have to have a component of research that looks at the alternatives to pain medications and pain management.

The current bill we have looked at is $18 billion for programs to combat opioid abuse issues, and that is a 400-percent increase from the previous year.

I am going to go through this. It might sound a little mundane and detail-oriented, but people say: That is good. We are "up" the amount of money that you are spending, but where are you really spending this money?

The Senator from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT, mentioned that it has to be done locally, and there is a lot of emphasis on where these dollars are going.

Some of them are going, of course, to the CDC, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, for prevention issues, which is critical, while $50 million is going to our community health centers. In States such as Alaska, West Virginia, and Missouri, community health centers are seeing hundreds of
thousands—millions—of people every day and many more who are dealing with mental health and substance abuse. SAMHSA oversees the mental health grants that go to our States, and there is $15 million for a new SAMHSA drug-units for opioid treatment. We have our drug-free communities program, which works well in my State. It is a total grassroots-up, bottom-up, when you get everybody from your local county or public health and others to try to stop this issue. Then again, there are some block grant programs to our community health centers along with the funding to NIH. This is a broad-based look at what the funding is going to.

We have an opportunity here in the next several weeks to “up” that funding, to make sure that the national priority that we feel, as Senators from States that are highly affected, is reflected in our funding. I believe that with Senator BLUMENTHAL’s leadership on the subcommittee and with other members on the subcommittee, that is something we are going to be doing.

I have the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, which appropriates the money for the high-intensity drug task forces. Our State has over 22 counties that are in that. Is that a problem that you really want—do you think that you are a high-intensity drug trafficking area? Not really. What that does is coordinate Federal, State, and local resources to help meet the challenge and face what a difficult problem you have. I don’t think funding there is an issue. I think the drug-free communities, and also with the President’s Office of National Drug Control Policy. We have done a lot, and we have pushed for resources.

The Senator mentioned resources for our first responders. He mentioned how dangerous it is. There have been local stories about our first responders who have just touched fentanyl—just touched it—and have gone into overdose deaths. We were at the White House yesterday and were talking, and the President mentioned drug-sniffing dogs that have had reactions to fentanyl. So this is a very lethal substance. Actually, I saw in the statistics for West Virginia that more of the recent overdose deaths are attributable to fentanyl than to heroin itself, and that is rising. We need the money for enforcement, prevention, treatment and recovery, and more resources for research, which I have mentioned how critical that research will be.

Nationwide, we had over 63,000 drug overdose deaths in 2016, and a number of these were attributed to heroin and fentanyl. In West Virginia, we had the highest deaths per 100,000 for overdoses. I would like to say it is happening somewhere in which maybe we would have predicted that it would happen, but it is happening everywhere. It is happening to the children of friends of mine.

Ryan Brown, a young man in West Virginia, lost his life. He had a loving home, loving parents, and had been through treatment. He just couldn’t fight it. He went back and injected himself with a lethal dose. He died in a very public place too. It was very tragic. To his credit, his parents have taken up his road to fight fentanyl when it is coming in. We know it is coming in from across our borders, principally from China, maybe China through Mexico. We need to equip our Border Patrol agents to be able to stop that—interdict the flow of that lethal substance.

Just this week, The Hill newspaper published an op-ed about the Martinsburg Initiative. Martinsburg is in West Virginia, in the Eastern Panhandle. Everybody needs to visit Martinsburg. They have been able to leverage a police-school-community partnership that is spearheaded by the Martinsburg Police Department, the Berkeley County Schools, and Shepherd University, along with the Washington-Baltimore HHS OPF. This is a comprehensive strategy of intervention and treatment for families to help prevent the beginning of the addiction to opioids.

In December, I attended the kickoff of the First Responder Fund, and I want to highlight what some of the local communities are doing in my State to try to get a comprehensive spectrum of solutions. This is a new scholarship program that was developed by Fruth Pharmacy, which is a local, family-owned pharmacy, that will allow people who have completed addiction recovery programs to get a jump-start on their college educations and career training. The mission of the program started it because they wanted to encourage people who have reclaimed their lives and been successful to be able to get back into the mainstream. We know one of the roadblocks to recovery is getting back into the workforce environment—to be able to get a job. Many of these young folks who are in this position have already burned through their education grants and their availability of Pell grants. So this Bridge of Hope scholarship is an organic, from-the-ground-up scholarship program for those who have been through treatment.

We had a young man who talked about his road to recovery and how important getting his education and getting back on his feet was. We need more everywhere. I think that is essential to all of us. We have to prioritize our Federal funding for States like West Virginia that have been the hardest hit by the opioid epidemic.

I see my colleague from New Hampshire here. Both of us have joined together on the Targeted Opioid Formula Act so that those of us who have high statistics and greater need are able to have those funds more squarely targeted toward us for prevention and treatment.

There are a lot of good ideas out there. There are a lot of tragedy around all of us. I would say to the folks in the gallery and certainly to everybody on the floor that you probably know a family—or you probably know somebody who has been hard hit by this. It is absolutely crushingly sad, heartbreaking, because it is preventable. It is something on which we can have an impact. If we don’t, we are going to lose another generation.

I have great fears that we are going to look back on this moment in time and think we didn’t do enough. So I think, with Senator BLUMENTHAL’s help and the help of others particularly with Senator BLUNT’s chairing the Appropriations Committee, this is the direction in which we need to go. We need to have more targeted funding so those local communities in order to stop the scourge, to handle the next generation as to how devastating this could be if one were to ever begin to go down this road.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, let me applaud my colleague from West Virginia, Senator CARPOSI, for her work in addressing the opioid epidemic. It is something that I know, in a bipartisan way, we care about in this Chamber, and it is one place in which I think we could come to some agreement about increasing resources and also an agreement on the budget for the upcoming year. So I thank the Senator for her comments.

SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, AND FBI

Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning because I believe the United States is a nation of laws. The bedrock of our democracy is the rule of law. We are blessed with a judicial system and Federal law enforcement agencies that are respected worldwide for their integrity, impartiality, and professional excellence.

As the lead Democrat on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, I have responsibility to balance budgets and to ensure that the Department of Justice, including Federal law enforcement agencies and Federal prosecutors, have the resources they need to keep our communities safe. I am committed to ensuring that Federal agents and Federal prosecutors are not working against the backdrop of political interference.

Mr. President, as the American people know, in 2017 the American people elected a President to serve as the prosecutor in chief. As you know, that President fired the FBI Director, who was leading an investigation into his campaign’s relationship to Russia. And the President then appointed a Special Counsel to complete that investigation. And it is my responsibility and duty to ensure that this Special Counsel is able to do his job.
On that score, I am deeply troubled by a rising chorus of partisan attacks on the integrity of the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and in particular Special Counsel Robert Mueller, who is investigating Russian interference in the 2016 election.

Actually, this is the cover of the report from our intelligence agencies on that interference in the 2016 election. I believe these attacks against Special Counsel Mueller are part of a broader campaign, orchestrated by the White House, to undermine the investigations into Russia's interference in the 2016 campaign, including the possible collusion by the Trump campaign. This effort to discredit the investigation has profound national security implications for the United States.

Yesterday, Senator BEN CARDIN, the top Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, released a report on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee that documents Russian President Vladimir Putin's two-decade assault on democratic institutions, Western values, and the rule of law. This report complements a finding by the U.S. intelligence community that Russia interfered in the 2016 election and will continue to interfere in our elections if it is not deterred. This was the unanimous conclusion of all 17 U.S. intelligence agencies. Yet President Trump continues to be dismissive of claims that Russia interfered.

This is not about partisanship. This is not about who won the election. This is about whether Russia is trying to disrupt our democracy. President Trump's comments about what happened here are an extraordinary abdication of the President's duty to defend our country and safeguard our democracy.

Our Foreign Relations Committee's report concludes: "Never before in American history has there been a threat to national security been so clearly ignored by a U.S. president, and without a strong U.S. response, institutions and elections here and throughout Europe will remain vulnerable to the Kremlin's aggressive and sophisticated malign influence operations."

Meanwhile, the campaign by the White House and certain Republicans in Congress to discredit and defame the investigative agencies is, I believe, a campaign that has become even more bizarre. Republicans on the Judiciary Committee refuse to release testimony by the cofounder of Fusion GPS—testimony regarding Russian efforts to collude with the Trump campaign. Last week, Senator GRASSLEY and Senator GRAHAM took the unprecedented step of calling on the Justice Department to investigate former British MI6 intelligence officer Christopher Steele, the author of the Fusion GPS report. Think about that. Instead of calling for an investigation of the serious charges in the so-called "Russia dossier," these Senators are demanding an investigation of the author of the report. Meanwhile, the President is becoming increasingly aggressive in attacking the investigations. Yesterday, he again called them a "witch-hunt" and demanded "Republicans should finally take control." The partisan attacks on Special Counsel Robert Mueller are especially shameful. A decorated marine Vietnam veteran, he is a Republican who was nominated to be FBI Director by President George W. Bush and was approved by the Senate, at that time, 98 to 0. In 2011, when his 10-year term was up, President Obama, a Democratic President, asked the Senate to extend his term for an additional 2 years. Director Mueller was confirmed for another 2-year term by a unanimous vote of 100 to 0.

When Mr. Mueller was appointed special counsel in May, he was greeted with bipartisan praise for his integrity and professionalism. Here are some of the quotes.

Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said:
I have a lot of confidence in Bob Mueller. I think it was a good choice.

Senator RUBIO said:
I believe these attacks against Special Counsel Mueller are baseless and reckless. They will not succeed in undermining the American people's faith and confidence in these institutions so vital to a healthy democracy. Supporting these efforts isn't a mistake. They will not succeed in deflecting law enforcement from its duties and missions, but they may well succeed in undermining the American people's faith and confidence in these institutions so vital to a healthy democracy. That is not only deeply unfortunate, it is shameful.

On June 13, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee. Because the Attorney General has recused himself, Mr. Rosenstein is the top DOJ official overseeing the special counsel. At the hearing, he again denied any evidence of good cause for firing Special Counsel Mueller. He answered: "No, I have not." In response to my further questioning, Mr. Rosenstein responded: "You have my assurance that regulation and Director Mueller is going to have the full . . . independence that he needs to conduct that investigation appropriately." More recently, on December 13, testifying before the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Rosenstein was again asked if there is good cause for firing Special Counsel Mueller. He responded with a "no.

Members of Congress and commentators in the media who are now attacking the special counsel, the Justice Department, and the FBI for partisan political purposes are making a grave mistake. They will not succeed in deflecting law enforcement from its duties and missions, but they may well succeed in undermining the American people's faith and confidence in our law enforcement agencies and special counsel. We are determined to faithfully fulfill our duties and missions. We will adhere to a strict ethic of honesty and impartiality, as do the nearly 37,000 employees of the FBI. They put their lives on the line every day to protect the American people from violent criminals and foreign agents who mean our country great harm.

Just last month, as the agency was being attacked on FOX News as equivalent to the Soviet-era KGB, undercover FBI agents were hard at work stopping an ISIS supporter who was planning a Christmas Day terrorist attack on Pier 39, the iconic San Francisco tourist attraction. This is just one example of more than 720 potential acts of terrorism that were disrupted and prevented by hard-working FBI agents last year. We can see the headlines from some of those plots that were thwarted in New York, San Francisco, Florida, and Oklahoma City.

The prosecutors in the Department of Justice are superb professionals who adhere to a strict ethic of honesty and impartiality, as do the nearly 37,000 employees of the FBI. They put their lives on the line every day to protect the American people from violent criminals and foreign agents who mean our country great harm.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the Clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the nomination of Walter David Counts III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Deb Fischer, John Barasso, John Thune, Roger F. Wicker, James M. Inhofe, James Lankford, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Todd Young.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Walter David Counts III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Baldwin     Gillibrand
Barasso     Grassley
Bennet      Hirono
Blumenthal  Sanders
Blunt       Hatch
Boozman     Roberts
Brown       Heitkamp
Burr        Hirono
Cassidy     Inhofe
Capito      Johnson
Casey       Jones
Cassidy     Kaine
Coats       Kennedy
Collins     King
Coons       Klobuchar
Corker      Lankford
Coryn       Lee
Cortez Masto Leahy
Crapo       Manchin
Cruz        Markley
Daines       McCain
Donnelly     Menendez
Duckworth   Menendez
Emmi        Menendez
Ernst       Moran
Feinstein    Murray
Feinstein    Murray
Fischer      Murphy
Flake        Murray
Flake        Murray
Gardner     Nelson
Gardner     Nelson

NOT VOTING—8

Alexander Durbin
Booker      Graham
Cotton      Heller

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to re-
then they used the rule, on top of what they changed, to bring people forward at greater speed, which they did. For the rest of the next year, they used it that way.

We now come to this time period. Let me give an example of what I am talking about and the frustration it creates. Let me confirm my number and make sure I get it right for all of the Senate history. From 1967 until 2012, there were 46 cloture votes invoked. That has to be fixed. The rule of the Senate is set by the Senators. In 2013, the Senators stood up and said “This has to stop,” and they fixed it. I am recommending again that the Senate, once again, implement the same rule that Democrats had in 2013 now, in this year, and instead of doing it for one Congress, make it the rule. If it was a good idea for Democrats in 2013 and 2014, why is it not a good idea for Republicans and Democrats now?

That simple rule is, when we can’t agree on a candidate, we would have only 2 hours of debate on a district judge—remembering that for the entirety of this week, it took the whole week to do four. We could cut the dead time, debating nominations—nominations like what passed today unanimously in the Senate. But we had to have cloture time set aside for it.

This has to be fixed. The rule of the Senate is set by the Senators. In the Senate history. From 1967 until 2012, the total number, Democrats did to Republicans in 1 year—last year.

The statement keeps coming up over and over again: Why can’t we get on legislation, get discussions going? Let us move on to the business of the Senate. Let’s get back to the business of doing legislation so that we can get this resolved.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

OFFSHORE DRILLING

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Trump administration’s recent proposal to expand offshore drilling to more than 90 percent of America’s coastal waters. In doing so, the Trump administration is threatening the Atlantic coast with unwanted oil drilling for the first time in more than 30 years, threatening to undo work that Democrats, Republicans, and Cabinet-level nominations.

Our coastal communities remember Big Oil didn’t like being told that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, one of the last undeveloped wild areas of the United States, was off limits. So President Trump and this Republican Congress included a provision in the Republican tax bill to allow drilling for the first time in this pristine reserve.

Big Oil didn’t like being told that our coasts, which provide the homes and livelihoods for millions of Americans, are off limits. So the Trump administration, faithful as ever to whatever Big Oil wants, issued a proposed offshore drilling plan that would allow drilling in more than 90 percent of America’s coastal waters. In doing so, the Trump administration is threatening the Atlantic coast with unwanted oil drilling for the first time in more than 30 years, threatening to undo work that Democrats, Republicans, and Cabinet-level nominations.

Our coastal communities remember Big Oil didn’t like being told that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, one of the last undeveloped wild areas of the United States, was off limits. So President Trump and this Republican Congress included a provision in the Republican tax bill to allow drilling for the first time in this pristine reserve.

Big Oil didn’t like being told that our coasts, which provide the homes and livelihoods for millions of Americans, are off limits. So the Trump administration, faithful as ever to whatever Big Oil wants, issued a proposed offshore drilling plan that would allow drilling in more than 90 percent of America’s coastal waters. In doing so, the Trump administration is threatening the Atlantic coast with unwanted oil drilling for the first time in more than 30 years, threatening to undo work that Democrats, Republicans, and Cabinet-level nominations.

Our coastal communities remember Big Oil didn’t like being told that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, one of the last undeveloped wild areas of the United States, was off limits. So President Trump and this Republican Congress included a provision in the Republican tax bill to allow drilling for the first time in this pristine reserve.

Big Oil didn’t like being told that our coasts, which provide the homes and livelihoods for millions of Americans, are off limits. So the Trump administration, faithful as ever to whatever Big Oil wants, issued a proposed offshore drilling plan that would allow drilling in more than 90 percent of America’s coastal waters. In doing so, the Trump administration is threatening the Atlantic coast with unwanted oil drilling for the first time in more than 30 years, threatening to undo work that Democrats, Republicans, and Cabinet-level nominations.

Our coastal communities remember Big Oil didn’t like being told that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, one of the last undeveloped wild areas of the United States, was off limits. So President Trump and this Republican Congress included a provision in the Republican tax bill to allow drilling for the first time in this pristine reserve.

Big Oil didn’t like being told that our coasts, which provide the homes and livelihoods for millions of Americans, are off limits. So the Trump administration, faithful as ever to whatever Big Oil wants, issued a proposed offshore drilling plan that would allow drilling in more than 90 percent of America’s coastal waters. In doing so, the Trump administration is threatening the Atlantic coast with unwanted oil drilling for the first time in more than 30 years, threatening to undo work that Democrats, Republicans, and Cabinet-level nominations.

Our coastal communities remember Big Oil didn’t like being told that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, one of the last undeveloped wild areas of the United States, was off limits. So President Trump and this Republican Congress included a provision in the Republican tax bill to allow drilling for the first time in this pristine reserve.

Big Oil didn’t like being told that our coasts, which provide the homes and livelihoods for millions of Americans, are off limits. So the Trump administration, faithful as ever to whatever Big Oil wants, issued a proposed offshore drilling plan that would allow drilling in more than 90 percent of America’s coastal waters. In doing so, the Trump administration is threatening the Atlantic coast with unwanted oil drilling for the first time in more than 30 years, threatening to undo work that Democrats, Republicans, and Cabinet-level nominations.
management that they place in doubt the safety culture of the entire [offshore drilling] industry.” The Federal Government vowed to crack down on the offshore oil industry that had been cutting corners at the expense of worker safety and environmental safety. The Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement studied ways to improve oil rig inspections and issued new rules of the road to try to prioritize safety.

But President Trump has abandoned that safety-first approach. He ignores the lessons of the BP oilspill. Instead, he listens to his Big Oil friends. Last month, the administration began rescinding key safety regulations designed to protect our coastlines from another BP spill disaster. I just want to give one example.

In 2016 the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement implemented new rules to require independent, third-party certification of safety devices. It is not a bad idea to get someone independent to take a look at oil rigs before people put their lives at risk and hundreds of thousands of people could lose their livelihoods if an accident occurred—not a bad idea. But the administration has said that this commonsense approach is an “unnecessary . . . burden” on industry. Just to be clear, this so-called burden would amount to less than a penny on the dollar for an industry that already enjoys tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies. That is less than a penny on the dollar to protect the livelihoods and maybe the lives of people living on our coasts.

The Trump administration’s insistence on padding the pockets of Big Oil while small coastal towns are left carrying all the risk is a perversion of how government is supposed to work, but this is what happens when the Republican Senate allows leadership positions at the Department of the Interior to be filled with industry insiders who reward their past—and, in many cases, their future—employers, rather than serving the American people.

American families deserve forward-looking leadership that builds for the future and ensures that America will lead in the necessary fight against climate change, but President Trump thinks leadership is handing over management of our public resources to the Big Oil companies who are loading their pockets while they can, and he chooses to ignore the writing on the wall.

Our planet is getting hotter, and 16 of the last 17 years were the hottest on record. Our seas are rising at an alarming rate. Our coasts are threatened by furious storms that can sweep away homes and devastate even our largest cities. Many communities are just one bad storm away from complete devastation. Our naval bases are under attack, and some ships are being built in rising seas. Our food supplies and our forests are threatened by an endless barrage of droughts and wildfires.

The effects of man-made climate change are all around us, and things will only continue to get worse at an accelerating pace if we don’t do something about it. Will addressing climate change be tough? You bet it will. We will need to retool, to install offshore renewable energy. President Trump’s offshore drilling rigs. But there is no country and no workforce in the world that is more willing and more able to tackle the challenges of climate change head-on than the United States. Yes, it is hard, but it is what we do. It is who we are.

The American people deserve leadership that knows the strength of the American people; leadership that believes in the innovative resolve of American workers ready to build clean energy infrastructure of the world; leadership that will deliver a clear message to the Big Oil executives, hellbent on protecting their own short-term profits, that we are not going to be told that a place is off limits; leadership that will not chain our economy to the fossil fuels of the past; leadership that does not ignore the realities of climate change; and leadership that does not put our coastal communities at further risk of devastating oilspill. The American people deserve leadership that works for their interests, not for the interests of Big Oil.

I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

THOMASINA E. JORDAN
INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT OF 2017

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today on a happy occasion, to discuss a House bill, H.R. 984, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act. This is a bill that the House passed the Chamber by the chiefs of six Virginia Tribes whose past, present, and certainly future are connected to this bill. I will speak briefly. Then, Senator Kaine will speak. Then, the matter will be called up for a voice vote. Various objections have been heard and then cleared, and so we are now ready to move forward with this bill, which passed the House in May.

This is about Virginia Tribes that were destroyed and encountered the English when they arrived at Georgetown in 1607—the Tribes of Pocahontas and so many other wonderful Virginians. They are living, breathing, active Tribes. They have never been recognized by the Federal Government for a series of reasons.

First, they made peace too soon, in a way, and they have been punished for that. They entered into peace treaties with the English in the 1670s. Second, many of their Tribal records were destroyed in the Civil War. Third, a State official destroyed other records during the 1920s through 1960s. The power of these Tribes having achieved State recognition many years ago—and they have never given up hope that they would be recognized by the U.S. Government, just as they have been recognized for hundreds of years by the Government of England. In fact, last spring, they went to England to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the death of Pocahontas. They were treated as sovereigns, treated with respect, and all they have asked is to be given the same treatment by the country they love.

This bill for Tribal recognition was first introduced by a Virginia Governor, then-Senator George Allen, in the 107th Congress. A House companion bill to the Senate version was passed in May, and that is the third time the House has passed this bill—first in 2007, and the second time was in 2009.

I have had many productive discussions, as has Senator Warner, over the last months about the bill, various questions about the history. We are here to acknowledge a historical record and talk about the history, and talk about the facts, that all objections have been cleared, and we are ready to move ahead.

It is such a treat to be joined by the chiefs. It is such a treat to be joined by my colleague, my senior Senator, Senator Kaine. Congress has vigorously hard on this, as have I, from the day he was Governor. I also have to give praise to Congressman Wittman on the House side, who has worked very hard to get to this day.

It is a fundamental issue of respect and fairly acknowledging a historical record and a wonderful story of Tribes who are living, thriving, and surviving and are a rich part of our heritage. This is a happy day to stand upon their behalf.

With that, I wish to yield to the senior Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me join my friend and colleague Senator Kaine. We and some of the folks who are in the Gallery today were not sure if this day would ever come. Even in the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Senate, occasionally we get things right. And, boy oh boy, this is a day where we get things right on a civil rights basis, on a moral basis, and on a fairness basis.

To our friends who are representatives of some of the six Tribes who are finally going to be granted Federal recognition, we thank you for your patience, your perseverance, and your willingness to work with us and others.

This has become an issue over the last 20-plus years. Democrats and Republicans alike in Virginia have acknowledged the fact that these six Tribes, whose history predates any European settlement in this country, whose history goes back, as Senator Kaine mentioned, where they were recognized by the United Kingdom and recognized by the British Government, but through a series of circumstances, in many cases abetted by a backwards-looking government earlier in the 20th
century in Virginia that discriminated against these Native Americans in ways that were outrageous, where in many ways records that told of their proud history in our Commonwealth were destroyed after the Civil War in fires and courthouses—these Tribes have persevered.

Today, finally, they are going to be granted Federal recognition and the respect that goes with that Federal recognition, and they will be granted certain additional opportunities in terms of special education, housing grants, affordable healthcare services, and most importantly, the ability to recover important artifacts in their history.

As has been mentioned, this bill has already passed the House. Rob Witty, a Republican Member, has been a champion.

Senator Kaine and I, both as Governors—in that role of Governor, one of the things that happen every day—everyday, these Tribes come in and, in effect, pay their taxes to the Commonwealth of Virginia. While Virginia has recognized these Tribes for some time, every year when we would have this ceremony—one of the most moving ceremonies that I know I have participated in as Governor, and I think Senator Kaine and Senator Allen, who was also a champion on this issue before us—these Tribes would come in and say: When will the U.S. Government recognize our existence, our history, and our legacy? Well, that wait is finally over.

In a moment, I am going to be asking for unanimous consent, and the long, long wait will come to an end.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Indian Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 984 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 984) to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. WARNER. I know of no further debate on the measure. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 984) was passed.

Mr. WARNER. I further ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the 1:45 p.m. vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate adopt and consent to the Counts nomination?

Mr. INHOFE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Ex] YEAS—96

Baldwin Gardner Nelson
Barrasso Gilbrand Paul
Bennet Graham Perdue
Blumenthal Grassley Peters
Blunt Harris Portman
Boozman Hassen Reed
Brown Hatch Risch
Burr Hirono Roberts
Canwell Reitkamp Rounds
Cappio Hirono Rubio
Cardin Hoeven Sanders
Carper Inhofe Sasse
Casey Isakson Schatz
Cassidy Johnson Schumer
Cochran Jones Scott
Collins Kaine Shelby
Corman Kennedy Smith
Cornyn Klobuchar Stabenow
Cortez Masto Lankford Sullivan
Cotton Leach Tester
Crapo Lee Thune
Cruz Manchin Tills
Daines Markley Toomey
Donnelly McCaskill Udall
Duckworth McConnell Van Hollen
Durbin Menendez Warner
Ezzi Merkley Warren
Ernst Morgan Whitehouse
Feinstein Murkowski Wicker
Fischer Murphy Wyden
Flake Murray Young

NOT VOTING—4

Alexander Heller
Hoekker McCain

The majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination was confirmed. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. AXELROD, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. PERDUE. Are there any other Senators desiring to vote?

The question is, Will the Senate adopt and consent to the Counts nomination?

Mr. INHOFE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 10 Ex] YEAS—68

Barrasso Feinstein Nelson
Bennet Fischer Perdue
Blumenthal Flaxman Peters
Burr Graham Portman
Boozman Grassley Reed
Burr Hirono Roberts
Capito Hatch Risch
Cassidy Johnson Roberts
Cochran Kaine Sheila
Collins Kennedy Shelby
Cortez Masto Klobuchar Sullivan
Cotton Krug Tumlinson
Crapo Lee Thune
Crane Manchin Tullis
Daines Markley Toomey
Donnelly McCaskill Udall
Duckworth McConnell Van Hollen
Durbin Menendez Warner
Ezzi Merkley Warren
Ernst Morgan Whitehouse
Feinstein Murkowski Wicker
Fischer Murphy Wyden
Flake Murray Young

NAYS—27

Baldwin Brown Paul
Barrasso Hirono Sanders
Canwell Hoeven Schatz
Coons Hirono Smith
Duckworth Klobuchar Tester
Durbin Menendez Udall
Ezzi Merkley Van Hollen
Ernst Morgan Warren
Flake Murray Wyden

Rapid DNA Act of 2017—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand the Senate has received a message from the House to accompany S. 139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 139 and ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators were destroyed after the Civil War in many ways records that told of their existence, many ways that were outrageous, where in many ways records that told of their proud history in our Commonwealth were destroyed after the Civil War in fires and courthouses—these Tribes have persevered.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.
The amendment is as follows: Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following: “This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1873 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1870
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1874 to amendment No. 1873.

The amendment is as follows: Strike “4” and insert “5”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

RUSIA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to share with my colleagues a report I released yesterday, which is the product of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The report is called “Putin’s Asymmetric Assault on Democracy in Russia and Europe: Implications for U.S. National Security.”

I commissioned this report to be done early in 2017. I had to make a decision on the allocation of resources, and I thought it was extremely important that the American people and the international community understand the breadth of Russia’s campaign against democratic institutions.

Yes, we saw it in 2016 in the U.S. elections, but that was only one part of a much broader design, and I recognized we needed to devote the resources at that time in order to make this report work. It is how Russia has interfered not just here in the United States but in Europe.

I want to start with the statement that this is not a partisan report. Yes, I commissioned it as the Democratic ranking member because decisions had to be made early in 2017 on the allocation of resources. I know the Presiding Officer knows, I worked very closely with Senator CORKER on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and throughout the development of this report, I have kept Senator CORKER informed.

The work of this report has relied upon the work of many Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. In fact, I think the Presiding Officer will recall the work we did—Democrats and Republicans—in the passing of legislation in 2017 that held Russia accountable for its malign activities. I was proud that I had the strong cooperation and support and leadership in developing that legislation from Senator McCain, Senator Graham, and Senator Rubio, who contributed greatly to the sentiment of that legislation, and on the Democratic side, Senator Menendez, Senator Shaheen, and Senator Durbin.
This report is the culmination of a year’s work. It had professionalism and dedication and patriotism of the very talented staff at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I want to acknowledge that because I know all of us recognize that our staffs are critically important to the work we do in the Senate.

Damian Murphy was our captain on this project. He was the one who provided the leadership to make sure we had a thorough report, that we had an accurate report, and that the recommendations would be tailored to make our Nation more secure. Terrell Henry provided incredible help throughout the entire year. Laura Carey was an instrumental part of getting this done. Megan Barkley helped us with making sure all of the sources were properly cited.

I also want to acknowledge my Democratic staff leader, Jessica Lewis, who really was the one who decided early on to get this done and encouraged me to move forward.

Lastly, this report has received considerable attention since I released it yesterday—considerable attention because this is the first comprehensive report on how the Russian Government’s actions beyond our own. Anyone who thinks the threat posed by Russia is limited to hacking emails or the American election in 2016 is missing the real story, and that is what this report shows.

We wanted to describe the scale and scope of this threat to make the American people aware that the Russian Government’s interference in the 2016 elections are part of a pattern of behavior and warn that Russia could attack again in 2018 and 2020. The Kremlin is a learning organization, and they are constantly perfecting and improving their techniques.

This report is the first government report to lay out in detail exactly how the Russians operate. Mr. Putin employs an asymmetric arsenal that includes military invasions—and they do use their military—but cyberattacks, disinformation and propaganda, and support for fringe political groups. They have employed the weaponization of energy resources. They have a network of organized crime, and they have a system that is fueled by corruption.

This threat existed long before President Trump and will remain following his tenure, unless he takes steps and we take steps to address it.

Mr. Putin's asymmetric arsenal are drawn from a Soviet playbook but updated with new technologies. These include propaganda and disinformation, cultivating political fringe, religious and cultural groups as influencers, and weaponizing crime and corruption as a system of governance.

In Europe, Mr. Putin’s Russia has invaded countries, attempted coups, cut off countries from energy in the middle of winter, temporarily crippled governments with cyberattacks, created a whole new way to exponentially spread fake news using bots and trolls, and used dirty money as a weapon to attempt to buy candidates and political parties. The report illustrates these events in more detail in the 19 countries across Europe.

The international response to the Kremlin’s arsenal has been a patchwork. Some European countries have shored up their democracies in ways the United States has yet to do, in a strategic, whole-of-government fashion. Europe’s experience with Russia’s meddling shows it can be deterred, and the United States must take steps to deter Russia now, as laid out in the report’s recommendations.

The report helps us to understand why Mr. Putin is doing this. He is doing this because that is all he has. Russia’s economy is faltering. It has a record military defeat it doesn’t have many friends around the world. Its economy is about 7 percent the size of the U.S. economy—ranks No. 12 in the world. It is smaller than Italy or South Korea or Canada, but we have to acknowledge he has taken advantage of the use of these tools, with the use of these weapons.

He has accumulated, by reported sources, more than tens of billions of dollars of stolen wealth. They have a propaganda machine that has been able to make him popular at home and accomplish many of his objectives in other countries. He has slowed down Serbia’s integration into the EU and Ukraine and Georgia’s ability to join NATO because of Russia’s troops located in its countries.

The report highlights the lessons we have learned from our Europeans. It is interesting, the Europeans understood this risk before we did. The Brexit campaign in the UK, Russia was clearly engaged in it. Prime Minister May has made a resolute public statement that Russia’s meddling is unacceptable and will be countered.

France looked at what happened in 2016 in the U.S. elections, and they took steps. The Macron campaign was subject to cyber attacks with emails from President Macron during the campaigns. They were able to counter that. The French Government worked with independent media and political parties to expose and blunt the dissemination of fake news.

In Germany, we saw the famous “Lisa case” that was fabricated by Russian-sponsored news outlets in order to incite the Russian-German community for an anti-migrant-type policy. The German Government bolstered democratic cyber security capabilities, particularly after the 2015 hack of the Bundestag, and the Interior Minister proposed creating a Center of Defense Against Misinformation. Germany has acted.

In the Nordic countries, the states have largely adopted a whole-of-society approach, with an emphasis on education that teaches critical thinking and digital literacy. They have a curriculum in their school for their schoolchildren to be able to differentiate between what is real and what is fake in the news.

In Lithuania, the government diversified its supplies of natural gas. All the Baltic governments have worked to integrate their electricity grids to reduce dependency on Russia for energy needs.

In Spain, the Spanish Government has investigated, exposed, and cut off significant money-laundering operations by Russia-based organized crime.
So what do we do about this? Russia has this plan to compromise our democratic institutions. What do we do about it? Well, the report spells out many, many recommendations. I am proud to say that many of these recommendations have been championed by many of my colleagues.

First, we call upon Presidential leadership. We need President Trump to acknowledge the threat and establish a high-level interagency fusion cell to coordinate the known elements of U.S. policy on the Russian Government's malign influence operations. The President should present to Congress a comprehensive national strategy and work to get it implemented and funded.

Second, the U.S. Government needs to support democratic institutions building and values abroad. We need stronger support for these programs. The United States should provide assistance to help bolster democratic institutions in other states.

Member of the U.S. Congress should conduct hearings and use their platform to make democracy and human rights an essential part of their agenda. I am proud of the work we have done in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Working with Senator Corker, we have highlighted human rights throughout the year, but we need to do more. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has recommended to the full Senate that we pass legislation so we can start educating every country and its ability to fight corruption, patterned after the “Trafficking in Persons Report” on human trafficking. We need to get that bill enacted into law.

Third, we need to expose and freeze Kremlin-linked dirty money. We should declassify any intelligence related to Mr. Putin's personal corruption and cut off Mr. Putin and his inner circle from the international financial system. We know that the elite class in Russia does not want to hold their money in rubles; they want dollars. We have to deny them that opportunity. They also would like visas to visit the United States; they don't want to be stuck in Russia. Those sanctions have to deny them that opportunity.

Fourth, we need to create a “state hybrid threat actors” designation and impose a sanctions regime. The United States should declare such actors that employ malign influence operations to assault democracies as “state hybrid threat actors.” Those designated would fall under a preemptive escalating threat that would be applied whenever the state uses weapons like cyber attacks to interfere with a democratic election or disrupt a country’s vital infrastructure. We need to make it clear that, yes, we want relations with all countries, constructive relations, but if they are going to use these weapons against the democratic institutions, we need to be prepared to increase our sanctions against these countries.

Quite frankly, what we must understand is the importance of democracy against what Mr. Putin is trying to do.

Fifth, we have to defend the United States and Europe against foreign funding that erodes democracy. We need to pass legislation to require full disclosure and shutoff of shell companies and owners and improve transparency for funding of political parties, campaigns, and advocacy groups. We have bipartisan legislation to do that. Let's get that passed.

We know that shell companies are shielding illegal funds. Let's make sure that Russia's game plan is not funded through shell companies that are located here.

Sixth, we need U.S. leadership to build global cyber defenses and norms and to establish a rapid reaction team to defend allies under attack. We should push NATO to consider the implications of a cyber attack within the context of article V and our ability to defend each other. We should also lead an effort to create an international treaty on the use of cyber tools in peacetime, modeled on the international arms control treaties.

Lastly, we need to hold social media companies accountable. Government contracts should be withheld for funding political advertisements. This is the new way of communications. We have to catch up with technology in our laws. We require traditional advertisers to disclose all this information, but we have not done it because we didn't know about it when we passed these laws. We have to make sure that we have full laws on disclosure. Companies should conduct audits on possible Kremlin-supported meddling in European elections over the past several years. Companies should establish civil society advisory councils and work with civil society and government to promote media literacy.

That is just a sampling of some of the recommendations that are in this report. It is pretty comprehensive, but I think it does give us a game plan to understand that we can protect our national security, and we must.

Following the end to World War II, the United States led the world in constructing the liberal international order, underpinned by democratic institutions, shared values, and accepted norms. It protects our shared security, advances our interests, and expands our prosperity. Yet the defense of that system of institutions and democratic principles is anathema to Mr. Putin, who seeks to protect little more than his power and wealth. It is therefore up to the United States and our allies to engage in a coordinated effort to counter the Kremlin's assaults on democracy in Europe, the United States, and around the world.

In closing, we must take care to point out that there is a distinction between Mr. Putin's corrupt regime and the people of Russia, who have been some of his most frequent victims. Many Russian citizens strive for a more transparent and accountable government that operates under the democratic rule of law, and we hope for better relations in the future with a Russian Government that reflects these values. We applaud the courage we saw very recently from the protesters in Russia, who stood up against Mr. Putin because they want basic freedom in their country.

I remember very clearly that when we passed the Magnitsky law that holds those who violated the basic human rights, in Russia, of Sergei Magnitsky, who was just doing his job as a lawyer—that they would be denied our banking system and denied the ability to travel to this country—when that bill was enacted, it was the people who were protesting against the government who said: That law passed by the U.S. Congress was the most pro-Russian bill passed by the U.S. Congress. We stand with the people of Russia.

I am also the ranking Democrat in the U.S. Helsinki Commission. I have worked for the Helsinki Commission for a long time. The Helsinki Commission includes all the countries of Europe and the former Soviet Union, the United States, and Canada. All countries of Europe and the former Soviet Union, the United States, and Canada. All countries that signed the Helsinki Final Act. It talks about basic democratic principles, and it gives each member state the right to challenge the activities of every other member state.

Each of us have an obligation to call out what Mr. Putin is doing because it is not only against our national security interests; it is not only hurting the people of Russia; it is against the commitments Russia made in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The United States must work with our allies to build defenses against Mr. Putin's asymmetric arsenal and strengthen international norms and values to deter such behavior by Russia or any other country.

I stand ready to work with all of my colleagues to protect our national security interests and to recognize the threat that Mr. Putin poses to our democratic institutions. I look forward to a day when we can truly have a better relationship with Russia because they stop this assault on democratic institutions in Europe, the United States, or anywhere in the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

MY SENATE AGENDA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, earlier this month, I announced that my current term of service would be my last. Since then, many of my colleagues have asked how I feel with my Senate tenure drawing to a close. I think many expect me to say that I feel an immense sense of relief. Hardly. If anything, the decision to retire has imbued me with a sense of urgency that I have never felt before.

With a year left in office, I have an agenda that is as ambitious as ever,
and the ticking shot clock is a constant reminder of just how much I have left to accomplish. Just 168 legislative days remain in my Senate term, and I can assure you that those 168 days will be among the proudest and the most productive periods in all my public service.

 Anyone who thought Orrin Hatch would coast quietly into his golden years clearly doesn’t know me. The stars have aligned for this year to be one of the most fruitful yet. I don’t expect me to go gentle into that good night. Expect me to be right here on the Senate floor, early and often, pushing the most critical reforms of this Congress. Expect me to take the lead on a Finance Committee agenda that will equal in ambition our accomplishments of 2017. Expect me to be the same steady presence in this body that I have been for the last 41 years.

 Above all, expect a flurry of legislative activity from my office. I have a dedication and a determination to drive this old workhorse into the ground. And I have arguably the best working relationship with this President of anyone on Capitol Hill. Add to this the advantages that accrue from a lifetime of legislative experience and bipartisanship.

 The point I wish to make is simple: In legislative terms, my final year could well be the most fruitful yet, and I hope it will be.

 In the months ahead, I am eager to capitalize on our tax reform victory by putting the Nation back on the path to fiscal sustainability, finding a way forward on immigration, and securing long-term funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program—a program that I helped put into law and have been very pleased with over the years. I also intend to update our intellectual property laws for the 21st century, enact key fixes to our higher education system, and continue to support our courts with as many qualified judges as possible. Likewise, I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle to improve the competitiveness of our workforce, strengthen digital privacy, and blaze new trails on medical marijuana research.

 But this brief overview doesn’t cover even half of my agenda for 2018, nor does it include some of the legislative surprises I plan for later this year. The virtuoso status of being a seven-term Senator with a reservoir of good will is that you have a little bit of latitude in your final year. That is why my plan is to go big and to go bold, because unless you are Michael Jordan, you retire only once, so you might as well make the most of it.

 The truth is, I put the pieces in place long ago to ensure that my final year in office would be a legislative knock-out, so no one should count me out, not for a single second, and anyone who does should be reminded that I can do in just a few months what it takes most a decade to complete. Tough old birds like me don’t have lameduck years; we just dig in and get tougher. For me, 2018 is not a victory lap but a sprint to the finish, and I plan to finish strong. I look forward to working with all of you until the very end.

 With that, I just want to say how much I love my colleagues on both sides of the floor, how much I have enjoyed working with all of you over all these years and will enjoy this remaining year hopefully even more. I hope I can do some things that will be very beneficial to our state and our country, and that will help us all feel better about our service here and help us all strive to do better together.

 I yield the floor.

 The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cassidy). The Senator from Ohio.

 Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from Utah, who just spoke, who is also the President pro tempore of this entire body, that he is well regarded on both sides of the aisle. I don’t think any Senator has had a more distinguished or consequential career—four decades of legislating.

 I want to assure the Senator that nobody thinks he is going to slow down. In fact, as he just said, he has plenty on his plate and he has big plans for the future and we look forward to working with him during that time period.

 We also wish him well on his retirement. I have talked to him a little about this. He has a wonderful family, and he has big plans for the future with some important work he wants to do in public policy through his foundation.

 I have so much respect for Senator Hatch. I thank him so much for what he did most recently to help guide us through this latest tax reform and tax cut bill that actually is making a difference for the people I represent and he represents.

 Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield, I thank the Senator so much. I am grateful for the friendship that I have had with all of you but especially with him. He is one of the up-and-coming, moving, strong Senators in this body. I have tremendous respect for his work ethic, the effort he has put forth on a daily basis, the ethics that he imposes upon himself, and the logistical all around way of doing the Senate’s work. I am very pleased to have him as a friend.

 Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Senator. I have to get the last word, though, because this is about the Senator.

 Senator Hatch said he loves this place and he loves its Members. There is a lot of love for him in this place on both sides of the aisle, and it is well deserved and earned.

 Russia

 Mr. President, I heard Senator Cardin earlier speaking about the threat that Russia poses not just to us—and the meddling that has been occurring here in our elections over the last few years—but also the threat that they pose to other democracies around the world, particularly in Eastern Europe. I appreciate his report. I appreciate the fact that he has worked with a number of us, including Senator Murphy, on the other side of the aisle, to put forward legislation to try to push back against this disinformation.

 In fact, we have required that the State Department increase their efforts through what is called the Global Engagement Center. I am meeting with the Deputy Secretary of State here after this speech, and I am going to spend more time with him about that, but we really want to be sure that the United States is taking more aggressive action against the kind of disinformation that can destabilize democracies.

 We heard some of the examples of what his report was able to uncover in terms of some of the Russian activity, particularly, again, in Europe and in Eastern Europe. This is an issue. It is a foreign policy issue that we have been, the last few weeks, the last year, to respond to. It didn’t start with the last Presidential election, and it will not end with this last Presidential election unless we take a more aggressive stance and step up.

 So I appreciate that it has been a bipartisan effort that we should acknowledge as Americans that it is in our interests to push back against the disinformation and the propaganda and the destabilization of democracies.

 Tax Reform

 Today, Mr. President, I wish to speak about some good news; that is, that here in Congress we actually did something with the tax relief and tax reform legislation that is actually creating a better economy and more hope for people.

 There was news announced today, just a few minutes ago, that is in addition to the news we have heard over the last few weeks about how the tax reform was created, we will remember, with two goals in mind. One was to cut taxes for middle-class families—so individual tax cuts. The second part of it was to make America a better place to do business. Let’s be clear, the chances of these businesses will be more jobs created here rather than elsewhere. Let’s level the playing field so our workers aren’t competing with one hand tied behind their back.

 As I have said through the process and as we developed this bill, we had a bipartisan agreement that our Tax Code was broken, but we couldn’t seem to come up with an agreement of how to fix it. Some Democrats said: Well, that’s great that you guys have done this bill, but it is not going to help. I said at the time: The proof will be what happens, what happens to jobs, what happens to wages, what happens to the economy in general, and what happens to your paycheck.

 I am here to announce today that the results have been pretty darn impressive, and they have been across the board—all of those things I talked about. The Senate passed this result by a bipartisan dealmaking.
that have stepped forward to talk about that. I now have a list of 150 businesses—and I am sure there are many, many more—that have decided to do something. Either they announced a pay increase, a bonus, an increased 401(k) contribution, increased pension contribution, or make a new investment in equipment and in technology to make workers more competitive. All of this is specifically because of the tax relief and reform bill. That is what is happening.

For those who haven't followed it, even today another company, Walmart—the largest employer in my State—announced that they are indeed going to increase pay and provide bonuses to over 1 million workers. Some companies have actually announced a combination of things, not just a pay increase but maybe a pay increase as well as an increased contribution to a 401(k) or an increased contribution to a charity.

So I think we are already seeing the direct effects—the direct and very positive beneficial effects—of this tax reform legislation, as many have hoped that we would see, given the fact that we wrote it to create these incentives for workers to do better jobs. But today we are going to begin to see the direct effects of the other part of the bill; that is, the tax relief directly to individuals. The IRS just announced about an hour ago that they are publishing updates to the tax withholding tables for employers. Now, what does this mean? This means that Uncle Sam is going to take a little less of your paycheck, and you are going to see it on your paycheck. So the withholding—the amount that is withheld from your paycheck with taxes—is going to be changed. The Treasury Department says that for 90 percent of Americans—90 percent—there will be a change in withholding that will be positive for them. In other words, they will have less money coming out of their paycheck.

Most people whom I represent in my home State of Ohio live paycheck to paycheck. This is really important. We talked earlier about how much this is going to be: $2,000 a family on average. That is the median income for a family in Ohio. Whatever the amount is, this is significant, and it is something that people are going to be pretty surprised about. That is why many people have misrepresented what this legislation is about. They are now seeing that it is about jobs, it is about wages, it is about bonuses, and so on. But they are also going to see in their own paycheck that it is about more take-home pay. It is about having a little healthier family budget.

So, again, as we went through this process, when we would have these debates I would say: I encourage people to look online, to look at the professionals to look at a tax calculator, I said: The proof is in your paycheck. I think the proof will be in their paychecks—more hard-earned money staying in their pocket rather than going to Washington is something that my constituents will like, particularly if we see this economy start to pick up because of this tax reform bill, which, by the way, will result in a stronger economy.

Therefore, there will be more revenue through growth. So the Federal Government will have more revenue coming in. Every 1-percent increase in GDP—a 1-percent increase in growth in the United States—results in $2.7 trillion in increased revenue coming into the Federal coffers. So that is more revenue coming in, not from a tax increase but from growth. That is the kind of revenue we want to have to be able to deal with many issues we face on the fiscal side, including our large deficits and debt, and that we will also begin to see as we see a better economy grow and develop because of this tax reform legislation. That is my strong belief, and, again, I think the evidence is pretty clear that we are headed that way.

I want to commend the IRS for moving so quickly because this is pretty quick for us to turn it around. We just passed the legislation at the end of the year. It became effective on January 1. Here we are on January 11, and we are already seeing them changing the withholding that is going to go to the employers so that employers will withhold less from people's paychecks. I also want to personally commend the Treasury Secretary, Steven Mnuchin, because I know he has a passion to make sure that our hard-working taxpayers get this tax relief as soon as possible. My sense is that he is the one who has promoted our moving quickly on this, in a professional and careful way so that the withholding tables are accurate but ensuring that we do allow people to begin to have a little more in their paychecks to be able to help them, and, with most people I represent living paycheck to paycheck this is a big deal. Steve Mnuchin has been, I think, essential to getting this done as quickly as it has been done, as he was essential in the tax reform legislation, along with Gary Cohn of the White House, and others.

So this law is going to help middle-class families in three main ways. First, it cuts taxes across the board. As I noted, the IRS announcement means that many taxpayers will see more money in their paychecks. They do this in a number of ways in the tax reform legislation, and I am talking about the reform notice here. It is Notice 1036. For those who want to go online and look at it, just go on the IRS website, irs.gov, and you can see it, the new withholding tables. They lay all of this out. Depending on how much your paycheck is, whether you are paid weekly, biweekly, semi-monthly, or monthly, you see what you are going to have more of by. But it happens because there is a doubling of the standard deduction, and most people already take the standard deduction in my State of Ohio. Now more people will take it because there is a doubling and essentially a zero tax bracket. So it goes from about $12,000 a family to about $24,000 a family.

It also has a lowering of the rate of taxes on your tax bill. So it means that you may have payroll taxes, if you still have payroll taxes, you get your benefit there. So these are the kinds of things that, combined, end up with this notice going out saying: You are going to have a little more in your paycheck.

Second, the result of these tax cuts is going to take about 3 million Americans off the tax rolls altogether. I say "about" because the Joint Committee on Taxation doesn't have the final number yet but they have told me that it is at least 3 million Americans who now pay income taxes who will no longer have income taxes. Now, they may have payroll tax liabilities, and they may have State and local taxes, but the point is that this was about Federal income reform and relief, and they are going to be out from under the IRS and again be able to help make ends meet. That is as a result of this legislation. I said earlier that about $2,000 per family is the average tax savings for a median family income in Ohio, $2,000 a year in tax relief is about the average.

This is important because as expenses have gone up over the last couple of decades—particularly, healthcare expenses in the last decade—wages have not. So wages have been relatively flat. In fact, on average, if you take inflation into account, they have been flat over the last couple of decades. We are beginning to see some increase in wages now. This is terrific, but with wages being flat and expenses up, people are already in a real squeeze, and that middle-class squeeze is real in my home State. So this is extra money that families—many people living paycheck to paycheck—can use for expenses like healthcare, maybe make a car payment, save for retirement, or maybe help their kids.

The second goal of this tax reform, boosting the American economy, is also beginning to happen, as I said earlier when the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act became law, immediately we saw a number of companies and businesses, small and large, around the country say: We are going to do something about this. I remember being home over the holidays and, actually the day after Christmas, December 26, I was talking with friends, and a guy who owns a small manufacturing business, the brother of a friend of mine, said: Would you be willing to come out to his little company to talk about the tax bill?

I said: Sure, if we can figure it out schedulewise.
He said: Because I want to give my employees a bonus. I am looking at this tax bill, how it is going to affect our little business, and what it is going to do for us to be able to invest more in the company, and I want to give my employees a $1,000 bonus—everybody, 137 employees and I also want to do something in terms of investing in my equipment because I want to make my people more competitive.

This is a small manufacturer in Cincinnati, OH, that makes a high-quality product, a precision product, and he wants to make sure that his people have the best equipment to be competitive. In his case, he has competition from overseas, as do a lot of American businesses, either directly or indirectly these days in an increasingly global economy, and he wants to be sure he is competitive. So I went there.

I went to the company, Sheffer Corporation, and I had the opportunity to talk about the tax reform bill and what it does. They heard. He made the announcement, and I can tell you that people were very happy because these are folks who work hard and play by the rules. They aren’t looking for any kind of a handout, but what they do want to know is that they will be able to see a little better future for themselves and their kids and their grandkids and not have that middle-class squeeze we talked about, where wages and expenses are up.

When the economy is not growing at a fast rate, which we have seen over the last decade, it is really a challenge. When we have an economy growing at 2 percent or less, it is tough to see that kind of open opportunity. Now, with this tax reform bill, I think we have a much better chance of seeing that. In fact, looking at some of the projections for next year, it looks like most people think the economy is going to grow at a better rate—maybe a half point or maybe a little higher. We don’t know. The point is that people are going to have more hope and opportunity.

It is not just Sheffer, though. In my hometown of Cincinnati, the Fifth Third Bank announced a companywide wage increase. So wages are going to go up for entry-level jobs and push all wages, as well as bonuses, for 13,000 employees in Cincinnati.

Actual numbers we have seen this. Tomorrow I will be at a plant in Cleveland, OH, that is putting more money into their pension plan. I think it is going to be about $15 million into a pension plan, which isn’t in terrible shape, but it could be a lot healthier. That is going to help those employees directly.

Last Friday I was at a plant in Columbus, OH, a small manufacturer, Wolf Metals. They do an awesome job there competing with people all around the globe, and they are going to make more investments in equipment. In fact, I like this comparison to the tax bill because one of the pieces of equipment—a $1 million piece of equipment they are going to replace with the tax bill savings—is 32 years old. The Tax Code that we reformed was 31 years old. So it is time, don’t you think, every few decades to actually reform our Tax Code, to bring it up to speed and give our workers the edge, just as it is time to replace that machine to give his employees, what they need to compete globally.

Nationwide Insurance in Columbus, OH, is going to reinvest in their workers. Western & Southern Financial Group, Boeing, Comcast, and AT&T are some of the big companies we have heard about. They have all announced increased investments in their workers and new investments in their operations as a result of this law.

With regard to Walmart, they employ about 1.5 million Americans now. As I said, it is the largest employer in Ohio, with over 50,000 employees. They are going to give $1,000 bonuses, and expand benefits for the workers as a result of this tax reform legislation.

So these are the results. This isn’t a hypothetical. This is not something we are just saying might happen; it is something that is actually happening. I think every single American is going to see a benefit from this because a stronger economy helps everyone. The 90 percent of people who see their withholdings change so that they have more tax relief are obviously going to see it. The people who work in the businesses we have talked are going to see it. But all of us benefit.

President John F. Kennedy once said something I think makes a lot of sense. He talked about a rising tide. He said, “A rising tide lifts all . . . [ships].” In other words, it helps to have a growing economy.

These results are going to help with regard to our competitiveness too. Riggs has pointed out where, because of our Tax Code, jobs and investments are going overseas. Now, we may not hear as much about this, but what we are going to see is fewer foreign companies buying U.S. companies and, therefore, less investment in jobs going overseas.

In 2016, the last year for which we have numbers, three times as many American companies were bought by foreign companies as the other way around. Ernst & Young has done a study saying that over the past 13 years, 4,700 American companies were purchased by a foreign company that otherwise would still be American if we had in place this tax bill that we have now.

Part of the result of this tax reform and tax cut legislation we are talking about today is obvious. We will see better jobs, higher wages, more investment in companies, more investment in retirement—all the things we all want to see. Republican and Democrat alike. Part of it is the tax cuts. Today, with the IRS announcement, people will see this in their paychecks. If not this next pay period, they will see it before February 15 because that is what the Treasury Department is requiring companies to do. So it is coming soon.

The other part we may not see, but I do believe, is that the decline we have seen in American competitiveness—the result being that jobs and investment go overseas—is going to start to reverse, and it is none too soon. We needed to do this years ago. Many of us have been talking about this.

Finally, we are putting American workers in a position where they can compete and they can win. Isn’t that what it is all about? I don’t want these companies going overseas. I don’t want three times as many American companies bought by foreign companies instead of the other way around. We don’t want that. What we want is people to say: I am going to invest in America and American workers.

I believe we have so many advantages in this country, and we are so blessed to be Americans. We have great universities. We have the opportunity here, through our workforce, to be as productive as anybody. But when we have a tax code that is holding us back, it is unfair. It is our responsibility as Members of Congress to fix it, and that is what we have done. We should have done this sooner, but now that we have done it, I think we will see continued good results, as we have talked about today. We are going to see the opportunity for more investments in American workers, in American jobs, in American families, and in American businesses, and that investment will pay off for all of us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, today I was honored to be invited to the White House and included in a small meeting with President Trump, and it was very clear that I was invited to the White House to stand with President Trump today. We talked about immigration, and today I was proud to stand with our President.

We have been crystal clear. Chain migration must end, period. Any solution to our current immigration crisis that the U.S. Senate will consider must include ending chain migration. Before I talk about the details of what chain migration is, I want to put it in perspective.

Our immigration crisis today has been longstanding. We had a law written in 1965 and other changes in 1986, but it has really not been since 1991 that there has been any meaningful immigration change.

Three times in the last 11 years, well-intended people in this body and in the House have done a yeoman’s job of trying to solve the comprehensive problem of immigration in the United States—without success. Here we are, again, right now, facing a deadline that the President has put on, and rightfully so. We have a sense of urgency.
The President has done a couple of things. He has defined the scope of the problem, and he has defined a sense of urgency for the people in Congress.

The legal immigration system right now is broken, but to deal with that, we have to deal with our entire immigration system in pieces. The reason I believe most past efforts have failed is that they tried to do a comprehensive solution.

Today, we are breaking it into three areas. First, our legal immigration system, and the next step might be our temporary work visas. Today, we bring in about 1.1 million legal immigrants a year, and I will talk about how that relates historically. But we issue about 2.2 million temporary work visas a year. Then the third issue is, of course, the people who are in the United States illegally.

President Trump had a meeting 2 days ago at the White House. In that meeting, he had Democrats, Republicans, Members of the House, and Members of this body, the Senate, and he drove consensus in that meeting.

It was very interesting that he had the media in there for almost 60 minutes for an open dialogue, and we heard from all of us that room about their position on these topics. I thought it was very interesting that the President had the courage to put this issue in front of the American people and create an air of transparency that we, as a country, have had on this issue in decades. In that meeting, he drove two conclusions: one, a scope of the problem, and two, a sense of urgency.

The scope is very simply defined as this: We have to address the DACA situation. The President has given Congress the date of March 5 to come up with a solution for these individuals who are in the country illegally—but not of their doing.

The second issue is border security. We know border security is a national security issue as much as it is an immigration issue. The good news is that we know that illegal crossings of our southern border are down dramatically this year just because of a couple of reasons. One is the enforcement of current law, and the second is an understanding around the world that we are going to deal with this issue.

The third piece of the scope is chain migration. Any solution to the DACA situation will have to address the issue of chain migration. The chain migration issue must include addressing the chain migration issue.

Then the last is this archaic diversity visa lottery we have in the United States that was related to at least one of the terrorist attacks, and chain migration was involved in this body of how to deal with that, and there is great latitude on the part of Republicans in this body to deal with that in a way, with our Democratic partners here, to get a consensus bill that solves this once and for all.

The second is border security. Here, with the President’s leadership and in these recent meetings with Democrats and Members of the House, there is a growing consensus that we can deal with the national security issues related to our southern border. We don’t need a 2,000-mile wall, as even the President of the United States has said just this week. We have some things we need to do, and we need to do them quickly.

The President today said that his goal is to get this done this year. Coming from the real world, I know that is possible. This President, who comes from the real world and is an outsider to this community here in Washington, knows that is possible, and I think he is going to hold us accountable to that.

The third piece of the scope is chain migration. I will say more about that in a minute.

The fourth is the diversity lottery. This diversity lottery has not served us well. It is not the number, but the way that is being handled. We know there is fraud, and we know this is a loophole terrorists are now using to put people in their chain inside the United States.

There is a growing consensus on these four elements of this scope that the President has defined, and we had a consensus in that room 2 days ago in the White House. There is consensus that we can get to a solution within the timeframe here, but let me be very clear. Any discussion about business, sports, or certainly in politics—has to have some symmetry. Therefore, any solution for the DACA situation must include a solution for our chain migration crisis.

We must continue working with the President. He is holding us accountable. He is moving at a business pace, but to do that, we really have to talk about chain migration. I understand there are those who might say we have to talk about, as well, but there is a lot of disinformation about what it really is.

Chain migration is nothing more than a law put in place in 1965 to allow legal permanent residents and U.S. citizens to sponsor people for U.S. citizenship. It was put in place in 1965. It has been updated a little bit. But today, a legal permanent resident—for the most part, this is someone who has come in qualified in our legal immigration system, who goes through a 5-year waiting period, who eventually can apply for U.S. citizenship. While they are a legal permanent resident, almost immediately they can sponsor spouses, minor children, and unmarried adult children. Once they become a citizen—and this is true of any U.S. citizen, whether they were a recent immigrant or were born here; a U.S. citizen can sponsor their parents, their spouses, minor children, unmarried adult children, married adult children, and siblings.

The issue around this is pretty simple. We have a chart here which shows that in 1965, when this law was put in place, approximately 300,000 U.S. citizens were brought into the United States in that year under this system. Last year, we had, roughly, about 1.1 million. We had a high of somewhere close to 1.5 million. But we can see this is a geometric progression that increases unbounded. It is not really the number here, but it is the balance that we have lost.

What happens, and the criticism I have seen, is a business guy looking at this, is that the individuals who determine who future immigrants are going to be are current and recent immigrants.

We don’t have many guidelines. We have a country cap system which says that most countries have a percentage of the total they have to have, and they can’t exceed that. But there is no real cap here, such that if all these numbers were maximized, then over time, we could see this number go up geometrically.

We have a second chart that shows this and demonstrates that over a very short period of time, the numbers can increase dramatically, as we have seen in the last couple of years.

There have been studies on this. Princeton has a study which says that right now, based on recent history, any immigrant who comes in sponsors somewhere around 35 future immigrants within a short period of time. We don’t know what the 3.5 immigrants do when they get sponsored and become citizens or legal permanent residents, but if you extrapolate this out—let’s say we cut it to 1 billion, or the ability to participate in the current system, which is now—that is still a very large number. We know that most countries have a percentage of the total they have to sponsor, and that most countries have a percentage of the total they have to have, and they can’t exceed that. But there is no real cap here, such that if all these numbers were maximized, then over time, we could see this number go up geometrically.

We have a second chart that shows this and demonstrates that over a very short period of time, the numbers can increase dramatically, as we have seen in the last couple of years.

There have been studies on this. Princeton has a study which says that right now, based on recent history, any immigrant who comes in sponsors somewhere around 35 future immigrants within a short period of time. We don’t know what the 3.5 immigrants do when they get sponsored and become citizens or legal permanent residents, but if you extrapolate this out—let’s say we cut it to 1 billion, or the ability to participate in the current system, which is now—that is still a very large number. We know that most countries have a percentage of the total they have to sponsor, and that most countries have a percentage of the total they have to have, and they can’t exceed that. But there is no real cap here, such that if all these numbers were maximized, then over time, we could see this number go up geometrically.

What is wrong with this system? The problem, as I said just now, is that future immigrants are determined by current immigrants without any regard to their ability to participate in the current system.

The second one is that because you can bring parents in, immigrants who come in under this system and become U.S. citizens can bring their parents in, and we have the situation of a sudden wave of aged population coming in—not a younger population—and they then draw social services on an already bankrupt system.

Chain migration is not based on skill or ability to participate in the current economic situation in the United States. Last year, we brought in 1.1 million immigrants. Of that, 140,000 were immigrants who were related to the worker; 70,000 were the workers, and the other 70,000 were their immediate family. So we can see that over 950,000 people were derivative iterations of what I am talking about.
The third thing is that if chain migration is not stopped, it continues to incentivize future illegal immigration because of what you can do once you get here. Chain migration is another problem with the DACA situation because if you permit a pathway to some sort of legalized situation in the United States for the DACA population, you end up with a situation where those people who are then legalized can sponsor their parents. The problem with that is, the DACA population is not violating fair law, but their parents have.

The last issue I will bring up is, the national security issues are profound. We have seen two national security incidents just this past year related to chain migration and the diversity visa lottery. There is more than enough evidence to show this has to be addressed.

Again, any symmetric deal on immigration to include, I believe, the four points the President talked about the other day. We have to deal with our border security, and that means building a wall. We have to deal with the chain migration issues, and we have to deal with this diversity visa lottery. The President demands that the American people demand it. Today, as a matter of fact, over 80 percent of America believes we need to deal with the DACA situation. Likewise, 72 percent of people in America believe the immigration issue should be the worker, the spouse, and their immediate minor children only—72 percent. I can’t think of another issue that has come before this body where we had those sorts of agreements in the American population.

The President wants results. He has charged leadership in this body and the House and those of us who have been involved in this for some time to get to it. There is a March 5 deadline looming. Some people say there is a January 19 date that has to do with funding. Some people say there is a March 5 deadline looming. There is a March 5 deadline looming. The Senate has a constitutional duty. The Senate has a constitutional duty to provide advice and consent on judicial nominations. I recognize that during the Trump administration we have not moved forward on judicial nominations, and I take this obligation very seriously.

The American people demand on judicial nominations. We have to deal with the DACA population, and we have to deal with the Dreamer population, and we have to deal with the future immigrant populations that are coming to the United States. We have to deal with those due dates, and we are having them now. I welcome input from all points. I am anxious to get to the bottom line of this.

I will close with this. It is exciting to have the executive branch on this issue that has put the responsibility back on this body to come up with something that will not allow us to be back here in the next 3, 5, or 20 years dealing with this same problem. We have a historic opportunity. It is time to get to it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I have been consistently fighting against closure motions to proceed to debate on judicial nominations, and I would like to take this opportunity to explain why. The Senate has a constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on judicial nominations. The Senate has a constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on judicial nominations.

The American people demand on judicial nominations. We have to deal with the DACA population, and we have to deal with the Dreamer population, and we have to deal with the future immigrant populations that are coming to the United States. We have to deal with those due dates, and we are having them now. I welcome input from all points. I am anxious to get to the bottom line of this.

I will close with this. It is exciting to have the executive branch on this issue that has put the responsibility back on this body to come up with something that will not allow us to be back here in the next 3, 5, or 20 years dealing with this same problem. We have a historic opportunity. It is time to get to it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I have been consistently fighting against closure motions to proceed to debate on judicial nominations, and I would like to take this opportunity to explain why. The Senate has a constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on judicial nominations. The Senate has a constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on judicial nominations.

The American people demand on judicial nominations. We have to deal with the DACA population, and we have to deal with the Dreamer population, and we have to deal with the future immigrant populations that are coming to the United States. We have to deal with those due dates, and we are having them now. I welcome input from all points. I am anxious to get to the bottom line of this.

I will close with this. It is exciting to have the executive branch on this issue that has put the responsibility back on this body to come up with something that will not allow us to be back here in the next 3, 5, or 20 years dealing with this same problem. We have a historic opportunity. It is time to get to it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I have been consistently fighting against closure motions to proceed to debate on judicial nominations, and I would like to take this opportunity to explain why. The Senate has a constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on judicial nominations. The Senate has a constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on judicial nominations.

The American people demand on judicial nominations. We have to deal with the DACA population, and we have to deal with the Dreamer population, and we have to deal with the future immigrant populations that are coming to the United States. We have to deal with those due dates, and we are having them now. I welcome input from all points. I am anxious to get to the bottom line of this.

I will close with this. It is exciting to have the executive branch on this issue that has put the responsibility back on this body to come up with something that will not allow us to be back here in the next 3, 5, or 20 years dealing with this same problem. We have a historic opportunity. It is time to get to it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I have been consistently fighting against closure motions to proceed to debate on judicial nominations, and I would like to take this opportunity to explain why. The Senate has a constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on judicial nominations. The Senate has a constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on judicial nominations.

The American people demand on judicial nominations. We have to deal with the DACA population, and we have to deal with the Dreamer population, and we have to deal with the future immigrant populations that are coming to the United States. We have to deal with those due dates, and we are having them now. I welcome input from all points. I am anxious to get to the bottom line of this.

I will close with this. It is exciting to have the executive branch on this issue that has put the responsibility back on this body to come up with something that will not allow us to be back here in the next 3, 5, or 20 years dealing with this same problem. We have a historic opportunity. It is time to get to it.

I yield the floor.
surprising that the ABA unanimously rated him “not qualified.” Because he was rushed through the nomination process, we only learned later that Mr. Talley failed to disclose that his wife works in the White House Counsel’s office. At her request, Republicans on the committee—Senator Grassley and Senator Kennedy—expressed their opposition to Mr. Talley, he, fortunately, withdrew from consideration.

We were not so lucky with Steven Grasz. The President nominated him and scheduled for a Judiciary Committee hearing before the ABA could complete its review. By the time the ABA finished its exhaustive evaluation, during which it found him to be not qualified, Mr. Grasz was nominated and scheduled for a Judiciary Committee hearing before the ABA could complete its review. By the time the ABA finished its exhaustive evaluation, during which it found him to be not qualified, Mr. Grasz was nominated and scheduled for a Judiciary Committee hearing before the ABA could complete its review. By the time the ABA finished its exhaustive evaluation, during which it found him to be not qualified, Mr. Grasz was nominated and scheduled for a Judiciary Committee hearing before the ABA could complete its review. By the time the ABA finished its exhaustive evaluation, during which it found him to be not qualified, Mr. Grasz was nominated and scheduled for a Judiciary Committee hearing before the ABA could complete its review.

Delays press reports that the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee now may be considering changing the Committee’s practice of observing the blue-slip courtesy, we, as a Conference, expect it to be observed even-handedly and regardless of party affiliation. And we will act to preserve this principle and the rights if it is.

Because of the profound impact that lifetime-tenured federal judges can have in our society, the founders made their appointment a shared constitutional responsibility. This is the Republican conference asking the Democratic majority, the Democratic President, and the chair of the Judiciary Committee to observe the blue-slip process.

President Obama, and the Democratic majority at that time, upheld the blue-slip process without exception. Last year, the Judiciary Committee held a nomination hearing for David Stras to serve on the Eighth Circuit despite receiving only two positive blue-slips from his home State Senators. This is the first time since the early years of the George W. Bush administration that the Judiciary Committee has held a hearing for a nominee when a home State Senator has not returned a blue slip. If the Senate proceeds to vote on and confirm Mr. Stras, it will be the first time since 1989 and only the third time in the last 100 years that a judicial nominee will be confirmed without having two positive blue slips.

I, certainly, take the chairman at his word that this was a one-time exception to the blue-slip process, but I will hold him and the President to the same standard they demanded from President Obama.

I will continue to rigorously defend the Senate’s constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on lifetime appointees to the Federal bench. Until we return to a normal process where we are able to do what the Constitution asks of us, I will continue to oppose invoking cloture on any judicial nominee, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in this position.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO JEFF COOK

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, every week, I try to come down to the floor and talk a little bit about my State and do a little bit of bragging in what we call our “Alaskan of the Week” series. Now, there is a lot to talk about with regard to Alaska. We would love for the people in the Gallery and the people who are watching to come out and visit our great State. It will be the trip of a lifetime. The scenery, of course, with the mountains and the mountains are rugged, but it is really the people who make my State so special—rugged, self-sufficient, kind, and very generous people all across an area that is over two and one-half times the size of Texas.

I apologize to my Texas colleagues, as they get a little upset when I talk about that, but it is true.

Every week, we have been recognizing a group or a person who has worked to make Alaska a stronger place, a stronger community—a State that, I think, is the best State in our great Nation. I call these individuals our Alaskans of the Week.

Today, I take all who are watching to Alaska’s interior, to a town called Fairbanks, AK, where about 32,000 of my fellow Alaskans live. It is a beautiful, wonderful place. Fairbanks is hot in the summer. My wife and I were married there many years ago. It was over 90 degrees when we got married in August, but it is really cold in the winter. We spent January 1, 2000—the millennium celebratory—Fairbanks with our kids and our family. It was 50 below zero without the windchill—cold. It is a place I love, where my wife was born and raised, where we lived, where my laws still live, and the place Jeff Cook, our Alaskan of the Week, calls home.

Jeff has been in Fairbanks his whole life. His parents moved to Fairbanks in 1938. He went to college in Oregon, and his wife Sue was there, but the couple moved back to Alaska, to Fairbanks, and started a family. He is now 74 years young. He and Sue have four children, two of whom have settled in Fairbanks, and they have five grandchildren. He is the patriarch of not only a great family but of many community organizations throughout Fairbanks and, really, Alaska.

Throughout the years, Jeff has had a career in real estate, in business. He has sat on numerous boards—community boards—and been in community groups. Let me just give a couple of examples of his community work, of his sitting on the board of the Fairbanks Community Hospital Foundation, the University of Alaska Board of Regents, the Rotary Club of Fairbanks, the Greater Fairbanks Community Hospital Foundation board, the board for the State of Alaska Chamber of Commerce, the Rasmuson Foundation board, and the boards for Alaska Airlines and Wells Fargo Bank. This is an individual—a leader—who has been involved in his community for decades. He is a perfect example of the community-minded individual whom we call our Alaskan of the Week.

We could be done right here. It is a pretty amazing career—a great example of someone who is dedicated to his State, to his country, to his community, to his family, Jeff Cook. He recently used all of his energy, all of his experience, all of his community involvement to embark on what really has become an extraordinary fundraising campaign to raise money for cancer research—so important for our community, our Nation, so important for Alaska. This became a personal issue for Jeff. Let me tell you this story.
Last March, he and Sue received, really, a devastating phone call from their youngest daughter Chrissy, who is 34 and lives in Las Vegas with her husband and 2-year-old daughter. She called to tell them the bad news—really, the horrible news that millions of American women face every day. It is the day that she had been diagnosed with breast cancer and that she had a positive match for the BRCA2 gene, which increases one’s risk of developing breast cancer or ovarian cancer.

Jeff started fighting against this disease when they heard this. He said: “When you’re a parent, it doesn’t matter how old your children are; you’re supposed to slay the dragons and conquer the monsters’ and protect your kids.

If that were not devastating enough, weeks later, he and his wife made sure that everyone in the Cook family got tested. Unfortunately, five other members of the family tested positive for this gene. They are all being monitored now.

Here is what Jeff said: “We couldn’t conquer the cancer, but we just had to do something.” He said he had heard about the American Cancer Society’s “Real Men Wear Pink” campaign—a fundraising program that is held in October. October, as everybody knows, is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. About 3,000 men from across the country participated in the program this year, the “Real Men Wear Pink” campaign.

So Jeff started. He started with the pretty impressive goal of raising $5,000 for cancer research and an email list of about 70 people, most of whom were in Fairbanks. Within 90 seconds after sending his first email, he had raised $1,000. Pretty good. Then what happened? The community of Fairbanks, of Alaska—really of the whole country—started opening up to his plea. Donations kept coming in. The more donations he received, the more Jeff worked at raising funds. Many of the people he knew were donating, but what happened? Strangers from across Alaska and from across the country started to send money for this very worthy cause of breast cancer research—often with heartfelt stories of their loved ones, of their own struggles with cancer, or of those of their kids. Someone from a small town in New York State sent him $250.

As the weeks passed, he began to pay attention to how he was stacking up against others across the country. Jeff is a competitive guy. He is very successful. When he reached No. 10 in the country in terms of fundraising for this very important matter, he told one of his friends there was no way he could beat the No. 1 person ahead of him who had raised $30,000—no way. That was a high number. Now, Fairbanks is not a very big city, and the other people on the list are from much bigger cities from across the country and had what he thought were larger connections and larger networks. Yet his friend told him: “Don’t underestimate yourself, Jeff.” After he read that, he said: “Okay. I’m going for broke.” This is what he did.

He was all in. He started fundraising everywhere. When it was all said and done, Jeff Cook, from Fairbanks, AK—a town of a little over 30,000 people in Alaska’s interior—was the No. 1 fundraiser in America for breast cancer research this year—No. 1. In terms of the American Cancer Society’s “Real Men Wear Pink” campaign, Jeff Cook was the No. 1 person ahead of him who beat the No. 1 person ahead of him who had raised $30,000—no way. That was a massive feat. Jeff was all in.

If my colleagues were down here, I would ask them for a round of applause.

That was for the entire country. Think about that. We come down to this floor a lot and debate cancer research, medical research—very important. Here is one individual in America who raised over $120,000 through his own energy and passion and for the love of his daughter. This is a testament to perseverance, but it is also about the good people in Fairbanks, throughout Alaska, and really throughout the country.

As Jeff said, “It says so much about our community. There was such an outpouring of support and generosity. That was the most touching part of [this entire experience].”

What else did Jeff learn? He heard that his daughter Chrissy, who underwent chemotherapy and a double mastectomy, was stronger than he ever imagined. She is recovering well, but she is still in recovery.

I am going to humbly ask my colleagues and those who are watching here and those who are watching on TV to put a prayer in for Chrissy and other cancer victims like Senator HIRONO, who was just on the floor. Put them on your prayer lists as they are in recovery—all of them.

I want to end with a big thanks to everybody in Alaska and across the country who are part of the “Real Men Wear Pink” campaign who are literally raising hundreds of thousands of dollars for breast cancer research.

I thank Jeff, of course, for not underestimating himself but for another—one—another—mission well done as a community leader in Fairbanks and throughout Alaska.

Congratulations for being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would have joined Senator SULLIVAN in a round of applause. I thank him for sharing that inspiring story.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon just to talk briefly about the real-world impacts of the decisions we are going to make in the next week or so regarding the future of the budget. I want to explore my Republican colleagues here, most especially the Republican leadership, to get this job done and not put us on another continuing resolution. This is not a theoretical or a rhetorical exercise; this is about people’s lives and our failure to do our job—our failure to pass a budget and to extend lifesaving programs, like the Children’s Health Insurance Program. It is not about politics or political posturing; it is not about point scoring. It is about making people’s lives better.

I really just want to share three stories from Connecticut to talk about the impact of the decisions that we are going to make with respect to the Federal budget. Let me first talk about this often esoteric-sounding concept of parity. One of the most important things that we are discussing is how many additional dollars are going to be in the budget for 2017 and 2018 versus in the prior fiscal year.

There seems to be fairly widespread agreement that we are underresourced when it comes to the Department of Defense. We have a multitude of key challenges that we need to address to the United States. A group of us just got briefed, once again today, by our military leadership on the scope and extent of the North Korean threat. I agree with many of my Republican colleagues that we need to increase funding for national security, but national security is not just housed in the Department of Defense. National security is also about making sure that our families are secure and that our communities are secure.

We believe that we should increase funds for the Department of Defense, and we should also make sure that our schools have teachers. We should also make sure that we have cops on the streets. We should also make sure that our bridges aren’t falling down. That is national security as well. It is not too much to ask that we make sure that our security is taken care of internationally and domestically as well.

I want to give you a perfect example of how you can’t just plus-up defense spending and leave the rest of the budget unattended to. We love defense spending in Connecticut. Why? Because we make a lot of big ticket items for the Department of Defense. We make the helicopters at Sikorsky. We make the jet engines at Pratt & Whitney. We make the submarines at Electric Boat. We are proud of all of them, but let me tell you what happens at Electric Boat when we plus-up the defense department at the expense of all of the other discretionary accounts. We are going to be building a lot more submarines over the next 10 years. We are now building two fast attack submarines a year. We are going to start building the new ballistic submarines, the Columbia class, and Electric Boat needs to hire 14,000 employees over the next 10 years. Much of that is because their workforce is older, and so they are going to have a lot of retirements. They have to train people. We are going to lose 14,000 employees over the next 10 years. If they can’t, we cannot make the submarines in the United States, or we cannot make the parts that go into...
the submarines in the United States. Either the job will not get done, or the work will happen somewhere else in another country. You can’t assemble the submarines anywhere other than at Electric Boat, but those parts will go to foreign companies rather than American companies.

The way in which we are going to fill the 14,000 jobs is through the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor is going to work with an organization called the Eastern Connecticut Manufacturing Pipeline. That is a public-private partnership that seeks to train hundreds of individuals in the skills necessary to build the submarines. They received 4,500 applications over the past year. They can’t place all those people because they only get a certain amount of funding from the Department of Labor, but they are able to train the workers for Electric Boat, putting them right into those jobs that are necessary to build these submarines. The problem is the money for that program is running out, and with another CR, they can’t get renewed for that program. So if you plus-up the Defense Department without increasing funding for the Department of Labor, you can’t get the stuff that you want to build for the Department of Defense because you can’t get the workers in order to fill the contracts.

If you don’t renew this contract, if you don’t renew this funding agreement with the Eastern Connecticut Manufacturing Pipeline, the work will not get done, and the jobs will go overseas. I just want my colleagues to understand that this isn’t some philosophical belief that we need the same amount of money in the Department of Defense as we need in the rest of the budget. It is practical. It is practical because we need domestic economic security, but you also can’t execute the Department of Defense contracts without funding in the rest of the budget.

Second, let me talk to you about the real-world implications of not funding the Children’s Health Insurance Program. You know that healthcare more than any other issue has become a political football. Democrats toss it to the Republicans, and Republicans toss it back to Democrats. Yet there is no other issue that is more personal than this. If someone doesn’t have healthcare for their family, nothing else in their life can happen.

I want to tell you a story. These letters and emails are flooding into our offices with respect to the real-world impact of not funding the Children’s Health Insurance Program. In Connecticut, many of these letters have gone out to families whose children are insured through CHIP, telling them that by the end of this month—that is 20 days away—they lose their insurance. So here is what Tara from Washington, CT, wrote. She said:

Despite our full time employment—
She works as a small business manager, and her husband is a full-time electrical apprentice—
my husband and I do not make enough money to buy health insurance for our children in addition to our other mandatory expenses.

She explains that her children go to daycare, which costs $1,800 a month, which she says is more than their mortgage plus taxes and insurance.

To go back to her letter, she says:

This is where the [Children’s Health Insurance Program] comes into our lives. I cannot even begin to tell you the anxiety I faced when I was pregnant with my daughter, crying every day because I didn’t know what we were going to do. Thank God for a family friend who happened to be an insurance agent. She told us about [CHIP] and suddenly some of that anxiety was quelled.

We have been blessed to have [CHIP] in our lives. I say CHIP. She says in the letter HUSKY. HUSKY is the name of the CHIP program in Connecticut.

We have been blessed to have [CHIP] in our lives. Last month my daughter got RSV and was prescribed a nebulizer. Two weeks ago, my son caught it and they developed into a double ear infection and pink eye, requiring two expensive medications. The co-pays and premiums are manageable though and they needed them.

I read in the [local paper] this weekend that letters were going out to parents of children . . . telling them that their coverage will end on January 31, 2018.

She is writing this in December. We are a week away from Christmas, and what should be a happy time of year has now turned into stress and depression. How am I going to get my kids? My daughter turns two on February 10th, how am I going to pay for her well visit? I can’t just skip it, they won’t allow her back into daycare.

I cannot believe the dysfunction going on in this country. I cannot believe tax cuts for the wealthy have taken precedent over the health of my kids . . . . What is Congress doing to ensure their continued healthcare?

This story is repeated literally millions of times over all across this country. People went through the holiday season because they were convinced that we weren’t taking seriously the healthcare of their kids. When we debate the budget, it has to have attached to it a long-term, if not permanent, extension of the Children’s Health Insurance Program because there are families just like Tara out there who are doing everything we ask them to. She is full-time employed, her husband is full-time employed, and they can’t afford health insurance for their kids without CHIP.

Let me tell you about the importance of making sure that we get the right amount of disaster funding to Texas, Florida, and in particular Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico matters to us in Connecticut because there are families just like Tara out there, who are doing everything we ask them to. She is full-time employed, her husband is full-time employed, and they can’t afford health insurance for their kids without CHIP.

They want to be back in Puerto Rico. I can report to you that the island is still in crisis. One hundred days after the hurricane hit, more than half of the country—half of the households—still don’t have electricity.

If that were happening in Connecticut, Alaska, or Louisiana, there would be riots in the streets, but for some reason it is acceptable in Puerto Rico. They are still putting up with the hurricane, and we still haven’t approved a disaster recovery package, and the Trump administration is nickel-and-diming the island.

I walked through the poorest, most densely populated neighborhood in San Juan, the capital of the Commonwealth. They have no power. Mold is growing in these homes because they can’t dry out the moisture without electricity. Kids are enduring more frequent and more intense bouts of asthma. People are dying because they can’t refrigerate their medication or keep their ventilation equipment running. This is what is happening in the United States of America. We need to authorize significant, robust funding for Puerto Rico and for Texas and Florida. We need to do it now.

We need to do it now because the day that I arrived on the island—I think it was January 2—I was transported to us that there was the highest volume of people leaving Puerto Rico since the hurricane—on that day, January 2. The exodus is getting more intense. More people are leaving, not less. Why? Because they don’t think that Congress is committed to rebuilding the island. Puerto Ricans don’t think that Congress is serious about putting back on the electricity. They waited 1 month. They waited 2 months. They waited 3 months and then those bills would have been expensive, we can’t put our kids in these conditions.

They started leaving in record numbers. They were leaving right off the boat because they had the numbers. While most of them are coming to places like Florida, many of them are coming to Connecticut. Why? Because when they make that move, they often go first to stay with friends. Because we have such a compassionate, large Puerto Rican community in Connecticut, many of these families are coming to Connecticut.

So let me just give you a couple of the numbers here. We asked our school district to try to keep track of how many new Puerto Rican students are showing up. Our cities are small in Connecticut. We don’t have a city that is much bigger than 100,000. In Hartford, they have 360 new Puerto Rican students in the last 18 months since the hurricane from the island. Waterbury, CT, has 268. New Britain, a very small city, has 213. Bridgeport has 179. These are kids who are glad to have shelter and schooling in Connecticut, but they come to Connecticut. They came under duress. They came to Connecticut as refugees. They want to be back in Puerto Rico.
The stress that this is putting on the schools is serious. We are in a budget crisis in Connecticut. Schools have already had their funding cut from Hartford. Yet these schools are now having to staff up to deal with this influx of students from Puerto Rico. We are glad to do it. We see it as our obligation, and we know that these kids will be a part of Connecticut's strength. But it is not easy to do when we haven't authorized any money to help States like Connecticut to deal with this influx of students. The principal at McDonough Middle School in Hartford, these kids are thriving, but they have had to set up a new immersion lab to handle all these kids coming in. They have had to hire new staff to teach English as a second language. These are schools that were already seeing their funding hemorrhage from the State government.

The impact is real on McDonough Middle School. The impact is real on Tara and her family from Washington. The family has had to look for an important supplier in our industrial base, Electric Boat. If we just continue to push CR after CR, these families, schools, and companies will not succeed. This isn't about political headlines. This isn't about numbers on a page. This is about real-world impact for businesses, families, and schools.

So let's get the job done. Let's write a budget. Let's at least agree to the overall budget numbers. Let's fund the Children's Health Insurance Program. Let's get the budget deal for an important supplier in our industrial base, Electric Boat. If we just continue to push CR after CR, these families, schools, and companies will not succeed. This isn't about political headlines. This isn't about numbers on a page. This is about real-world impact for businesses, families, and schools.

So let's get the job done. Let's write a budget. Let's at least agree to the overall budget numbers. Let's fund the Children's Health Insurance Program. Let's get the budget deal for an important supplier in our industrial base, Electric Boat. If we just continue to push CR after CR, these families, schools, and companies will not succeed. This isn't about political headlines. This isn't about numbers on a page. This is about real-world impact for businesses, families, and schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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 EARL BUSH

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Earl Bush, the judge-executive in Bracken County, KY, who will retire at the end of his current term. In my home State, a judge-executive is the highest elected county official, and since 2011, Earl has earned a reputation for accomplishment on behalf of the people of Bracken County.

After graduating from Western Kentucky University, Earl served our Nation in the U.S. Air Force, earning the rank of captain. For the next three decades, Earl worked at Dayton Power and Light in various construction management positions.

In 2010, Earl decided to put his efforts to work for his neighbors because, like so many of us in public life, he wanted to make a difference. Along with his team, Earl has spent his time in office working to help the men and women of Bracken County. As a former county judge-executive myself, I know firsthand about Earl's wide-ranging responsibilities. Looking at his results, Earl seems to have been successful.

In addition to equipment upgrades and road improvements, Earl has also championed the addition of recreational trails and a fishing lake at a local industrial park. Working with other officials, Earl lowered taxes and helped the county's largest employer bring new jobs to Bracken County. By nearly any standard, that is an impressive record of accomplishment for a public official.

I have enjoyed every opportunity I have had to work with Earl. Throughout his time in office, he has been a strong partner as we serve the people of Kentucky. In retirement, Earl looks forward to spending more time with his wife and grandchildren. He also plans to work with his brother to restore classic cars. Along with many in Bracken County, I wish him a relaxing next chapter, and I am confident that my Senate colleagues will join me.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for votes relative to the nominations of Michael Lawrence Brown to be a U.S. district judge for the Northern District of Georgia and Walter David Counts III to be a U.S. district judge for the Western District of Texas.

On vote No. 7, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on confirmation of the Brown nomination.

On vote No. 8, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the motion to invoke cloture on the Counts nomination.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the votes on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 389, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 435, and the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 435.

On vote No. 7, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 389. On vote No. 8, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 435. On vote No. 9, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 435.

Mr. President, I was also necessarily absent for the vote on the motion to proceed to the House message to accompany S. 139.

On vote No. 10, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to proceed to the House message to accompany S. 139.

250TH ANNIVERSARY OF SANFORD, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the city of Sanford, ME. Sanford was built with a spirit of determination and resiliency that still guides our community today, and this is a perfect time to celebrate millions of hard-working and caring people who have made it such a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

The year of Sanford’s incorporation, 1768, but our long journey of progress, a journey that is inextricably linked to the history of our Nation. In 1661, British Army General William Phillips purchased large tracts of land from two chiefs of local Abenaki Tribes for his growing lumber business. Called Phillipstown, the lands remained largely uninhabited due to the ongoing conflict between England and France for control of the northern American Colonies.

Hostilities in the region ceased in 1739, and the new community grew rapidly, reaching a population of 1,500 within just a few decades. At the time the town was incorporated in 1768, Maine was a province of Massachusetts, and the Governor of Massachusetts used the occasion to honor Peleg Sanford, stepson of William Phillips and former four-term British Governor for the State of Rhode Island.

When the American Colonists fought for independence, Sanford stood with them. The city’s cemeteries contain the headstones of 33 patriots who joined freedom’s cause.

With the Mousam River providing power, Sanford was home to more than a dozen sawmills and gristmills. In the 1860s, Sanford truly became a city of industry when Thomas Goodall established a massive textile mill that produced everything from material for clothing to railroad car upholstery. Skilled textile workers poured into Sanford from Europe and French Canada, giving the city an international flavor that still exists today.

In the 1950s, the owners of Sanford’s textile mills began moving operations to southern States, leaving behind thousands of jobless workers and vast, empty factories. Local business and community leaders responded with the energy and determination that defines the city, traveling throughout the country to entice new employers. Noting this remarkable effort, Life magazine called Sanford “refused to die.” Today Sanford has a diversified industrial base, from textiles to technology.

Sanford is among Maine’s oldest municipalities, but it also is Maine’s newest industrial city, having charted from the town form of government to that of a city in 2013. It is also new in the sense of embracing the technology of the future through the construction position in the largest municipally owned broadband network in Maine for economic development and a 50-megawatt solar array for renewable energy generation. The new Academic and Career
Technical High School that will open this summer reaffirms Sanford's commitment to education.

The celebration of Sanford's 250th anniversary is not merely about the passing of time. It is about human accomplishment. We celebrate the people who, for longer than America has been a nation, have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community. Thanks to those who came before, Sanford, ME, has a wonderful history. Thanks to those there today, it has a bright future.

80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SHAWNEE PEAK SKI AREA

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 80th anniversary of the Shawnee Peak Ski Area in Bridgton, ME. Shawnee Peak is the oldest continually operated major ski facility in Maine and possesses natural beauty, which combines with the love of the outdoors and the strong sense of community of the region's residents.

Originally called Pleasant Mountain Ski Area, the facility opened with a rope tow on January 23, 1938. That day of celebration was preceded by many years of hard work by Bridgton's Lion's Club and Chamber of Commerce, Bridgton Academy, the Pleasant Mountain Ski Club, and the local Civilian Conservation Corps to plan, raise money, and clear trails. With Maine's Western Mountains providing spectacular views of the Lakes Region and Mount Washington, Pleasant Mountain soon began attracting skiers from throughout New England.

Renamed Shawnee Peak in 1988, the ski area has long been a place of innovation, including the site of Maine's first T-bar and chairlift. Shawnee Peak pioneered night skiing and in the 1970s helped to lead the acrobatic freestyle skiing movement that is now a favorite event in the Winter Olympics. Shawnee Peak is also a leader in offering youth programs in skiing and snowboarding to encourage children to stay active and to challenge themselves.

In 1994, Shawnee Peak was purchased by business leader and entrepreneur Chet Homer and his family. Echoing the conservation ethic that defines our State, Mr. Homer has stated he does not think of himself as owning the mountain, but rather of being its steward.

For 80 years, Shawnee Peak Ski Area has strengthened Maine's skiing industry, spurred economic development in a rural region, and brought families and friends together in wholesome recreation. It is a pleasure to congratulate Chet Homer and his team for the accomplishments of this Maine family business and to wish them continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO DR. HOWARD WILLSON

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I am honored to recognize my friend, Dr. Howard Willson, as Wyoming's 2018 Physician of the Year. Over the course of his distinguished career, Dr. Willson tirelessly worked to improve healthcare in Wyoming. His contributions in medical education, quality improvement, and public health touched countless lives outside of medicine. Dr. Willson served Wyoming as member of the University of Wyoming's board of trustees and as an officer in the U.S. Air Force.

In addition to his many professional accomplishments, folks in Basin and Thermopolis simply know Howard as their family doctor. Multiple generations of patients benefited from Howard's caring and compassionate approach to medicine. From Dr. Willson's perspective, being entrusted to care for his neighbors was the highest compliment he could receive.

While Howard Willson made his greatest impact in Wyoming, he was born in the small town of Spring Lake, Washington. After earning his undergraduate degree from Florida State University, he was commissioned as an officer in the U.S. Air Force. Howard then attended medical school at the University of Florida and graduated in 1965. He completed his medical school, he completed his internship at the U.S. Air Force Hospital at Andrews Air Force Base. In total, Dr. Willson served in the Air Force for 10 years, eventually rising to the rank of captain.

Over the next several years, Dr. Willson practiced medicine in Florida, where he served as an active member of the medical community. Then in 1976, he decided to make the move to Wyoming, a decision that has benefited the people of our State ever since. Howard began his practice in the town of Basin and eventually moved to Thermopolis. Once he arrived in Wyoming, Howard not only became a valued doctor, but also an energetic member of the community.

He quickly became active in his county's medical society and in the Wyoming Medical Society in 1986. In addition, he was an active leader of the medical staff of two different Wyoming hospitals, South Big Horn County Hospital and Hot Springs County Memorial Hospital.

In addition to his active medical practice, Dr. Willson was passionate about training the next generation of Wyoming healthcare providers. In particular, Howard wanted to introduce medical students to the joys and rewards of working in rural communities. This is why he was an active preceptor in the Wyoming Family Practice program for over 20 years.

To this day, medical students in Wyoming are benefiting from Dr. Willson's passion for medical education. This is in part thanks to the State of Wyoming, which allows students from Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho to attend medical school at the University of Washington. Wyoming joined this unique and highly effective program in 1996. As Professor Joe Steiner, former dean of the University of Wyoming College of Health Sciences, said, "Howard Willson was instrumental in bringing WWAMI to Wyoming. He was also a strong supporter of all health care professions and was eager to share his knowledge with students."

Aside from teaching, Dr. Willson was passionate about improving the quality of healthcare received by Wyoming patients. He served as medical director of Mountain-Pacific Quality Health Foundation—Wyoming. This organization is dedicated to working with Medicare to lower the cost and improve the quality of healthcare. In particular, Howard understood that achieving this goal meant serving as a partner with providers and healthcare facilities. It was through this work that virtually all the patients in Wyoming were helped by Howard's work, even though they never knew it.

Finally, Howard knew the importance of public health in helping keep folks well. He served as the public health officer for Hot Springs County, starting in 2004. It was with deep regret that the board of commissioners accepted his resignation in 2016. These folks knew what an impact Dr. Willson had made on their community.

Outside of medicine, Howard was always involved in the local communities in which he lived. The Governor of Wyoming appointed Howard to the University of Wyoming's board of trustees. He served the university with distinction from 2003 to 2015. Simply put, all the students of the University of Wyoming benefited from Howard's passion for making sure that everyone in our state could get a great education.

Clearly Howard Willson is one of the most accomplished doctors in the history of Wyoming. I can think of no person more deserving of being our State's Physician of the Year.

In closing, I would like to congratulate Howard, his wife, Belenda, and their six children on this most well-deserved achievement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING MONTANA YOUTH CHALLENGE ACADEMY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing the Montana Youth Challenge Academy (MYCA), located in Dillon, MT. The MYCA is sponsored by the Montana National Guard and the State of Montana and assists at-risk youth in our state to develop the skills necessary to become productive citizens. This academy focuses on the physical, emotional and educational
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–4027. A communication from the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of the Comptroller’s 2017 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4028. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Financial Stability Oversight Council, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Financial Stability Oversight Council on the Implementation of the Freedom of Information Act Regulations (12 CFR Part 1301) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4030. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Roadside Safety Hardware Identification Methods”; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4031. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report on the continued compliance of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan with the 1974 Trade Act’s freedom of emigration provisions, as required under the Jackson-Vanik Amendment; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4032. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Arms Control and Disarmament Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to Saudi Arabia in support of the assembly and integration of cannons onto weapons stations in the amount of $50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17–044); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4033. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation” (RIN0990–AA6B) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.


MESSAGEs FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.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 bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 140. An act to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4567. An act to require a Department of Homeland Security overseas personnel enhancement plan, and for other purposes.

At 12:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 139. An act to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

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

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 4567. An act to require a Department of Homeland Security overseas personnel enhancement plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary:

Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Joseph D. Brown, of Texas, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas for the term of four years.

Matthew D. Krueger, of Wisconsin, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of four years.

Norman Euell Airflack, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Ted G. Kaminetz, of Iowa, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Iowa for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2293. A bill to amend section 214(c)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the data reporting requirements relating to nonimmigrant employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2294. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that individuals may access documentation verifying the monthly housing stipend paid to the individual under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.
By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2296. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.0 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 2297. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System lands to Custer County, South Dakota; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. MARKY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SHAREEF, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, Ms. WAREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2298. A bill to prohibit oil and gas leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of New England; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2300. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 111 Market Street in Saugerties, New York, as the “Maurice D. Hinchee Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. GANNETT (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MARKY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STabenow, Mr. Kaine, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2301. A bill to strengthen parity in mental health and substance use disorder benefits; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 2302. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Bureau of Land Management land in Cache County, Utah, to the city of Hyde Park, Utah, for public purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISAACSON (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 2303. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to preserve consumer and employer access to licensed independent insurance producers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Ms. WAREN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BURR, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. DONELLY):

S. 2304. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to protect veterans from predatory lending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2305. A bill to require a study and report on the housing and service needs of victims of trafficking and individuals at risk for trafficking; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HARRAMP):

S. Res. 322. A resolution congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2017 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HARRIS:

S. Res. 373. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of “Korean American Day”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 615

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of employees that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 678

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 678, a bill to establish privacy protections for customers of broadband Internet access service and other telecommunications services.

S. 963

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 963, a bill to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation’s social programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1023

At the request of Mr. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1023, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Mr. DAINES, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a home infusion therapy services temporary transitional payment under the Medicare program.

S. 1767

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1767, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 1808

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1808, a bill to extend temporarily the Federal Perkins Loan program, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1939

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCAR, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1939, a bill to enhance transparency and accountability of online political advertisements by requiring those who purchase and publish such ads to disclose information about the advertisements to the public, and for other purposes.

S. 2077

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senators from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2077, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding proprietary institutions of higher education in order to protect students and taxpayers.

S. 2084

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2084, a bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1977 to establish a program to provide advance payments under the Emergency Conservation Program for the repair or replacement of fencing.

S. 2122

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senators from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2122, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for assistance for victims of child pornography, and for other purposes.

S. 2235

At the request of Mr. DONELLY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2235, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

S. RES. 367

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was
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added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 367, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its violence against demonstrators and calling for peaceful resolution to the concerns of the citizens of Iran.

S. RES. 368

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 368, a resolution supporting the right of all Iranian citizens to have their voices heard.

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 368, supra.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 372—CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2017 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 372

Whereas the North Dakota State University (referred to in this preamble as “NDSU”) Bison won the 2017 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the “NCAA”) Division I Football Championship Subdivision (referred to in this preamble as the “FCS”) title game in Frisco, Texas, on January 6, 2018, in a victory over the James Madison University Dukes by a score of 17 to 13;

Whereas NDSU has now won six NCAA championships;

Whereas the 2017 FCS title was a tremendous victory, and dedication of Bison Nation that has helped propel the success of the team; and

Whereas the 2017 NCAA Division I FCS championship was a victory not only for the NDSU football team, but also for the entire State of North Dakota; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the North Dakota State University Bison football team as the 2017 champions of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision;

(2) commends the North Dakota State University players, coaches, and staff for—

(a) their hard work and dedication on a historic season;

(b) fostering a continuing tradition of athletic and academic excellence; and

(3) recognizes the students, alumni, and loyal fans that supported the Bison while the Bison sought to capture a sixth Division I Football Championship Subdivision championship for North Dakota State University.

SENATE RESOLUTION 373—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF “KOREAN AMERICAN DAY”

Ms. HARRIS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 373

Whereas the influence of Korean Americans may be traced throughout the United States, including politics, industry, entrepreneurship, volunteerism, the arts, and education;

Whereas 182 courageous Korean immigrants arrived in the United States on January 13, 1903, initiating the first chapter of Korean immigration to the United States, the land of opportunity;

Whereas these pioneer Korean immigrants faced tremendous social and economic obstacles as well as language barriers in the United States;

Whereas in pursuit of the American dream, Korean immigrants initially served as farmworkers, wage laborers, and section hands throughout the United States;

Whereas, through resilience, tenacious effort, and immense sacrifice, first generation Korean immigrants established a new home in a new land that became the home for future generations of Korean Americans;

Whereas the centennial year of 2003 marked an important milestone in the history of Korean Americans;

Whereas the House of Representatives passed House Resolution 487 to commemorate “Korean American Day” in the 109th Congress;

Whereas the Senate passed Senate Resolution 283 to commemorate “Korean American Day” in the 109th Congress;

Whereas, just as other immigrants before them, Korean Americans—

(1) came to the United States seeking opportunity and a better life; and

(2) have thrived in the United States due to strong work ethic, family bonds, and community spirit;

Whereas Korean Americans have made significant contributions to the economic vitality of the United States and the global marketplace;

Whereas Korean Americans have invigorated businesses, nonprofit organizations and other nongovernmental organizations, government, technology, medicine, athletics, arts and entertainment, journalism, religious communities, academic communities, and countless other facets of society in the United States;

Whereas Korean Americans have made enormous contributions to the military strength of the United States and served with distinction in the Armed Forces during World War I, World War II, and the conflict in Korea;

Whereas South Korea will host the 2018 Winter Olympics in PyeongChang, South Korea; and

Whereas the Centennial Committees of Korean Immigration and Korean Americans have designated January 13 of each year as “Korean American Day” to commemorate the first step of the long and prosperous journey of Korean Americans in the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of “Korean American Day”;

(2) urges the people of the United States to observe “Korean American Day” so as to have a greater appreciation of the invaluable contributions that Korean Americans have made to the United States; and

(3) honors and recognizes the 115th anniversary of the arrival of the first Korean immigrants to the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1870. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention backlogs, and for other purposes.

SA 1871. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1870 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 139, supra.

SA 1872. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 139, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1870. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.’’

SA 1871. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1870 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

SA 1872. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.’’

SA 1873. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1872 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.’’
DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”

SA 1874. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1873 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 1872 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “4” and insert “5”

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I have 3 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 11, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “U.S. Policy in Syria Post-ISIS”.

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 11, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on S. 2152 the “Amy, Vicky, and Any Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act” and on the following nominations: Stuart Kyle Duncan, of Louisiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE
The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 11, 2018, at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing a closed roundtable.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR
Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Laura Carey, who is a fellow on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff, on loan from the State Department, during today’s session.

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

APPOINTMENT
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114–196, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission: Rosa G. Rios of Maryland.

CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2017 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUB-DIVISION TITLE
Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 372, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 372) congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2017 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Sub-Division title.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 372) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s Record under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO AWARD THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO JOHN L. CANLEY FOR ACTS OF VALOR DURING THE VIETNAM WAR
Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4641, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4641) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 4641) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 2018, AND TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 2018
Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for a pro forma session only, with no business being conducted, on Friday, January 12, at 1 p.m., and that following the pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until Tuesday, January 16, at 4:30 p.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 139; further, that the filing deadlines under rule XXII with respect to the cloture motion filed during today’s session regarding the House message to accompany S. 139 be at the following times on Tuesday, January 16: 4:45 p.m. for all first-degree amendments and 5:15 p.m. for all second-degree amendments; finally, that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote be waived.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M. TOMORROW
Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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 4:20 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 12, 2018, at 1 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS
Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 11, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

M Isabella Bueso, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit

MICHAEL LAWRENCE BROWN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

WALTER DAVID COUNTS III, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The table was closed without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate proceeds to the immediate consideration of the following nominations:

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for a pro forma session only, with no business being conducted, on Friday, January 12, at 1 p.m., and that following the pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until Tuesday, January 16, at 4:30 p.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 139; further, that the filing deadlines under rule XXII with respect to the cloture motion filed during today’s session regarding the House message to accompany S. 139 be at the following times on Tuesday, January 16: 4:45 p.m. for all first-degree amendments and 5:15 p.m. for all second-degree amendments; finally, that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote be waived.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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 4:20 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 12, 2018, at 1 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS
Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 11, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL LAWRENCE BROWN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

WALTER DAVID COUNTS III, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

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

The table was closed without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate proceeds to the immediate consideration of the following nominations:

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for a pro forma session only, with no business being conducted, on Friday, January 12, at 1 p.m., and that following the pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until Tuesday, January 16, at 4:30 p.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 139; further, that the filing deadlines under rule XXII with respect to the cloture motion filed during today’s session regarding the House message to accompany S. 139 be at the following times on Tuesday, January 16: 4:45 p.m. for all first-degree amendments and 5:15 p.m. for all second-degree amendments; finally, that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote be waived.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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 4:20 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 12, 2018, at 1 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS
Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 11, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL LAWRENCE BROWN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

WALTER DAVID COUNTS III, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
Recognizing Dr. David Arbutina for his service to Tyrone Regional Health Network and Community Members in the Central Pennsylvania Region

Hon. Bill Shuster
Of Pennsylvania
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. Shuster. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize David Arbutina, MD, FACS, Founder and Medical Director of Tyrone Regional Health Network’s Breast Cancer & Women’s Health Institute.

Dr. Arbutina is a board certified general surgeon with a focused area of expertise in breast cancer surgery. He is a Fellow in the American College of Surgeons and a retired Colonel of the United States Air Force.

During his military career, Dr. Arbutina served at United States Air Force bases in Japan and California. He served as Chief of Surgery and Chief of Hospital Services in Japan at Misawa Air Base. He also served as the Commander of the second largest department of surgery in the Air Force at Travis Air Force Base.

Dr. Arbutina is a nationally recognized educator and leader in surgery. Since 1988, he has dedicated his career to the treatment of breast cancer and has personally treated over 1,000 breast cancer patients.

As Medical Director of the Breast Cancer & Women’s Health Institute, he has provided educational programs in the community and authored articles on breast health and breast cancer topics to educate community members and raise breast health awareness.

Dr. Arbutina is recognized for his unwavering commitment to educate women on breast health issues and provide guidance to empower them with the knowledge they need to make the right decision regarding their care.

Personal Explanation

Hon. Ron Kind
Of Wisconsin
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. Kind. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Wednesday, January 10, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of S. 140.

Honor the Life of Frank Napolitano

Hon. Zoe Lofgren
Of California
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, January 11, 2018


Frank Napolitano was born and raised in New York City, where he spent his formative years, before military service and moving to California. He was a successful chef, restaurateur and businessman for over two decades. He met and later married the former Grace Flores Musquiz in 1982 and began a post-business career as a prominent community volunteer and philanthropist.

Frank Napolitano rose to become a highly recognized leader with the City of Norwalk where he served for many years as Chairman and member of the Senior Citizens Advisory Commission; he was designated Citizen of the Year by the Norwalk Community Coordinating Council; and prior to that served on the city Parks and Recreation Commission. He also served as an officer and member of several civic and fraternal organizations including the Norwalk Knights of Columbus as a Fourth Degree Member and the Norwalk Lions Club as a Melvin Jones Award recipient.

It was during these many years that he worked tirelessly on several important community benevolent projects including distributing turkeys and food baskets to families in need during the holiday seasons. He was instrumental in organizing many community carnivals and fairs on behalf of the city and service organizations at the City Hall Lawn to raise much needed funds for their community projects.

Frank’s commitment to community service, led to his most significant and long-lasting program, the Norwalk Santa’s Sleight Foundation. Together with Norwalk Mayor Luigi Vermola and Vermola’s daughter Lisa Salas, they co-founded the annual Santa’s Sleight visitation program in 1989 in cooperation with the City, Los Angeles County Fire and Sheriff’s Department to distribute toys and goodies to Norwalk Youth and Families throughout the Christmas and holiday season. This award winning program has been imitated by numerous cities and has provided countless families with extra Christmas spirit for decades.

In recognition for his business acumen and community service, Napolitano was appointed to the California state Senate Insurance Committee Advisory Commission on Small Business in 1986. He served for several years advising on the effects of insurance industry practices on small businesses. He left the commission upon the election of his wife Grace to the California State Assembly in 1992.

Frank Napolitano was the constant protector and provider for his large combined family which today has grown to four generations including children, grandchildren and great grandchildren, also his son Louis Napolitano of New York. Frank was the bedrock of continuous support for his beloved wife throughout her career that began with service to the Norwalk City International Friendship Commission, later elected to the Norwalk City Council, the California state Assembly and for the past twenty years as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives serving for ten terms in Congress.

Today, The California Democratic Congressional Delegation salutes and honors an outstanding husband, father and civil servant, Mr. Frank Napolitano. We will join all of Frank’s loved ones in celebrating his incredible life. He will be deeply missed.

Kazakhstan’s Role in Global and Regional Security

Hon. Ken Buck
Of Colorado
In the House of Representatives
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. Buck. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the important role Kazakhstan plays in ensuring regional and global security.

Since declaring its independence from the former Soviet Union in 1991, Kazakhstan has shown its leadership in nuclear disarmament by working with the United States to eliminate regional nuclear weapons stockpiles. From the closure of the Semipalatinsk Test Site in 1991 to the opening of Kazakhstan’s Nuclear Security Training Center in 2017, the country has demonstrated its leadership in strengthening international security through promoting non-proliferation in the region.

Kazakhstan’s commitment to nuclear security extends past non-proliferation, as the country also promotes safe nuclear power to support the needs of the international community. The U.S. recently supported Kazakhstan’s offer to host the world’s first low-enriched uranium bank, which will help to guarantee that all nations have an energy source for peaceful civilian nuclear power. Affordable energy is a prerequisite for modernization in Central Asia, and future access
HONORING MR. SAMUEL K. BEAMON, SR.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sam Beamon, a native of Waterbury, Connecticut. The Waterbury Fellowship of Christian Churches will be recognizing Sam at their annual Martin Luther King, Jr. Service for Sam’s lifelong commitment to public service and his leadership in Connecticut’s African American community. Sam has spent his career in service to others both in the military and as a civilian, and his dedicated work and perpetually friendly demeanor have made him an instrumental and beloved member of the Waterbury community.

Sam’s interest in serving his country began at a young age, and he joined the Young Marines in 1960. He later served in the United States Marine Corps during the Vietnam War and earned numerous commendations for his service, including 16 Air Medals, the Combat Action Ribbon, and the Good Conduct Medal. Upon returning to Connecticut, Sam joined the Waterbury Police Department in 1970 and rose through the department’s ranks to fill a number of important roles, as well as stepping into a vital role as an advocate for African Americans and breaking down institutional racial barriers. During his nearly three-decade career with the Department, Sam worked as an Accident Investigator, a radar operator, and on the SWAT Team.

Throughout his career and after his retirement, Sam has also been active in a number of civic organizations and causes. He has been an advocate for veterans in Waterbury and across Connecticut, and, in 2014, Sam became the chairman of the Waterbury Veteran’s Memorial Committee. He has also worked to improve the lives of and opportunities for young people, particularly those who face socioeconomic challenges, to pursuing meaningful opportunities to engage with their community.

Mr. Speaker, Sam Beamon has spent his life in service to his country and community, and it is proper that we honor him on MLK Day for his countless contributions. I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with Sam and even luckier to count him among my friends.

TRAFFICKING AND OTHER VICTIMS’ RIGHTS GROUPS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following list of trafficking and other victims’ rights groups:

1. American Society of Victimology
2. Futures Without Violence
3. International Organization for Victims Assistance (IOVA)
4. Justice for Children
5. Justice Solutions
6. National Alliance to End Sexual Violence (NAESV)
8. National Association of Victim Assistance Administrators (NAVAA)
9. National Center for Victims of Crime
10. National Chapter of Parents of Murdered Children (NCPOMC)
11. National Children’s Alliance (NCA)
12. National Criminal Justice Association
14. National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV)
15. National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)
17. Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN)
18. Security on Campus
19. Stop Child Predators
20. Witness Justice
21. Shared Hope
22. Penelope’s House
23. Center for Child Protection and Family Support
24. Texas Association Against Sexual Assault
25. Texas Council on Family Violence
26. Rights4Girls
27. PROTECT
28. National Network 4 Youth
29. Children at Risk
30. Justice Fellowship
31. Community Action Stops Abuse (CASA)
32. SEARCH
33. End Child Prostitution and Trafficking (ECPAT-USA)
34. Demand Abolition
35. Equality Now
36. Polaris
37. State/Peace Corps Victims Advisory Board
38. Tahini
39. National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC)
40. Foster Family-based Treatment Association
41. Silence is not Compliance
42. Thorn
43. Coalition to Abolish Slavery & Trafficking (CAST)
44. Love 146
45. Saving Innocence
46. Hope for Justice
47. Breaking Free
48. Hope Against Trafficking
49. Not for Sale
50. Run 2 Rescue
51. Slavery Footprint
52. Truckers Against Trafficking
53. 5th Day Center for Justice
54. Free the Slaves
55. Physicians for Human Rights
56. Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women
57. Save the Children
58. United Against Human Trafficking
59. HEAL Trafficking: Health, Education, Advocacy, Linkage
60. Alliance to End Slavery and Trafficking
61. Courtyard’s House
62. Stop Child Slavery
63. Freedom Place
64. Clergy Center for Security on Campus
65. Children’s Assessment Center
66. Ending Child Slavery at the Source
67. Covenant House
68. Joy International
69. International Safe Travels Foundation
70. Arc of Hope
71. Voices of Justice
72. My Life My Choice
73. Fair Girls
74. Colors of Hope
75. Pearls inc.
76. Zoe Children’s Home
77. Phantom Rescue
78. Anti-Slavery
79. Bryan’s House
80. New Life, New Hope
81. #HelpErase
82. Dallas LIFE Shelter
83. Stop the Traffik
84. Generation Freedom
85. Nest Foundation
86. Restore NYC
87. The End It Movement
88. The Exodus Road
89. Tiny Hands International
90. Everyone’s Kids
91. For the Sake of One
92. Hagar International
93. Fast 21
94. Traffick911
95. Free the Captives
96. Beauty from Ashes
97. Gems
98. Her Resiliency
99. Amnesty International
100. Pillars of Hope

SAFER STREETS ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Safer Streets Act which creates a new grant program that focuses on violent crime in our local communities. Reducing violent crime should be a priority for the federal government.

In my district 228 people were killed in 2016. The deadliest year in two decades. In
H.R. 3731, SECRET SERVICE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION ACT OF 2017

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3731, the Secret Service Recruitment and Retention Act of 2017.

The United States Secret Service is operating under tremendous demands with very limited resources. The agency is tasked with protecting a large presidential family that travels frequently around the world. This year, members of the Trump family have traveled to Uruguay, the Dominican Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the Republic of Ireland, among other destinations. The Secret Service provides protection on all of these trips, in addition to protecting the president himself, and each of these trips requires the Secret Service to incur significant costs, including travel, lodging, and costs associated with coordinating with local security entities, embassies, and other overseas partners. The Trump family does not reimburse the Federal government for costs associated with protecting family members on these trips, even when they are made in pursuit of the Trump Organization’s business interests and to promote the Trump brand.

The scope of the Secret Service’s protective mission, along with other agency activities such as investigating and preventing counterfeiting, has created a hole in the agency’s budget. At a June 8, 2017, hearing before the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security, Secret Service Director Randolph “Tex” Alles testified that the agency’s budget is “$200 million to $300 million a year short of what would be required” to fulfill its protective and investigative missions more effectively.

This bill will not solve the Secret Service’s budget gap, but it will prevent Secret Service agents from having to bear the brunt of challenges they did not create. Many Secret Service agents have hit their overtime pay limits and are unable to receive further compensation despite having to work additional hours given the agency’s expanded mission. Such a system is unfair to the agents, who work difficult jobs with long shifts and uncompromising schedules even when they are being fairly compensated.

H.R. 3731 would allow the Secret Service to pay agents for hours they have worked, which is the least we can do. I urge the Senate to pass this bill as soon as possible.

CONGRATULATING WTTW’S CHICAGO TONIGHT: THE WEEK IN REVIEW AND JOEL WEISMAN

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate WTTW’s Emmy-Award winning series, Chicago Tonight: The Week in Review, on its 40th Anniversary. January 19, 2018 will also mark Mr. Joel Weisman’s final appearance as host and senior editor of the program. Chicago Tonight: The Week in Review is the longest running series in the history of WTTW and a staple of Chicago news media, representing the city’s longest running television series with a single host or anchor. Mr. Weisman has been senior editor since the show’s inception.

Mr. Weisman is a lifelong Chicagoan and has been with WTTW since 1973, beginning as political editor and commentator on WTTW’s nightly news program, The Public News Center. When The Week in Review premiered on January 20, 1978, it served as a 30-minute conversation series. Throughout its four-decade history, Mr. Weisman welcomed hundreds of reporters to his rotating four-person weekly panel long before this format became commonplace in national TV programming. At Mr. Weisman’s insistence, the panelists were nonpartisan and diverse, first representing print and broadcast, and later, digital media.

In 2008, he was deservedly inducted in the Silver Circle of the Chicago/Midwest chapter of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. Mr. Speaker, I applaud Mr. Joel Weisman for his tireless dedication to WTTW’s Chicago Tonight: The Week in Review throughout his long and storied career delivering vital information—and entertainment—to Chicagoans. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Weisman on his invaluable contribution to WTTW and our community’s civic dialogue.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF BISHOP JOHN HURST ADAMS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Bishop John Hurst Adams of the African Methodist Episcopal Church (A.M.E.). Bishop Adams devoted his life to service of the Church and communities across the country. His relationship with the church began as a deacon in 1948, and culminated with the Senior Bishopric from 1988 to his retirement in 2004. In those 50 years of steadfast service to the A.M.E Church, Bishop Adams also stood as a pillar of the African American community in his active work with the John Center on Policing and Economic Study, The King Center Development Board and during his six-year tenure as the President of Paul Quinn College, located in my district. At that
time, he was the youngest person named to the presidency of the College, as well as the youngest college or university president in the nation. He also did extraordinary work as the Founder and Chairman Emeritus of the Conference of National Black Churches. Bishop Adams had a longstanding and dedicated commitment to serving the cause of civil rights, and to bettering the lives of children through education. I personally witnessed his remarkable life and devotion in the fight for justice and I am truly grateful and honored to acknowledge him.

Bishop Adams is survived by his loving wife, Dr. Dolly Deselle Adams, their three children and eight grandchildren, for whom we offer our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, I’d like to offer my gratitude for the work done by Bishop Adams, and honor his legacy and belief that “the strength of the African American community network allows it to support each other and come together”.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, I was unable to vote on Roll Call votes 005 through 013. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Roll Call 005—No; Roll Call 006—No; Roll Call 007—No; Roll Call 008—Yes; Roll Call 009—Yes; Roll Call 010—Yes; Roll Call 011—Yes; Roll Call 012—Yes; and Roll Call 013—Yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK POCAN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, during my medical recovery, I missed the following roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

December 13, 2017
No on Roll Call No. 676
No on Roll Call No. 677
No on Roll Call No. 678
No on Roll Call No. 679
No on Roll Call No. 680
December 14, 2017
Yea on Roll Call No. 681
No on Roll Call No. 682
Yea on Roll Call No. 683
No on Roll Call No. 684
December 18, 2017
No on Roll Call No. 685
Yea on Roll Call No. 686
Yea on Roll Call No. 687
December 19, 2017
No on Roll Call No. 688
No on Roll Call No. 689
Yea on Roll Call No. 690
Yea on Roll Call No. 691
No on Roll Call No. 692
Yea on Roll Call No. 693
No on Roll Call No. 694
Yea on Roll Call No. 695
December 20, 2017
No on Roll Call No. 697

No on Roll Call No. 698
No on Roll Call No. 699
Yea on Roll Call No. 700
Yea on Roll Call No. 701
No on Roll Call No. 702
Yea on Roll Call No. 703
December 21, 2017
No on Roll Call No. 704
No on Roll Call No. 705
Yea on Roll Call No. 706
Yea on Roll Call No. 707

RECOGNIZING VETRI VELAN AND KATHY SHIELD

HON. BARBARA LEE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the tremendous advocacy of two UC Berkeley students whose diligent work mobilized graduate students around the country against the greatest tax scam in American history.

When President Trump and Congressional Republicans introduced legislation to reform the tax code, many of us recognized it for what it was—a blatant attempt to provide millions and billionaires with large tax breaks, while eliminating many of the provisions that provide the working class and the poor with means to improve their standing in society. This terrible bill, passed without proper debate and process just before the holidays, will permanently stack the deck in favor of the rich and well-connected. In fact, we know that 83 percent of the bill’s benefits go to the richest 1 percent of our society. To pay for these unnecessary tax breaks for the rich, the bill adds more than $1 trillion to the national debt—a debt that our children and generations to come will continue to bear.

In the face of this immoral redistribution of wealth to the rich, people around the country were rightfully outraged, and many of my constituents were strongly opposed to its passage.

In particular, I would like to recognize two of my constituents for their efforts to highlight a particularly damaging section of the original bill, and commend them for their actions to have it removed from the final package.

Soon after the horrid GOP tax bill was introduced, Vetri Velan, a physics PhD student at UC Berkeley, developed an analysis of the bill. With the majority of doctoral and master students receiving institutional or fee waivers, Vetri realized that if tuition remissions were deemed taxable, graduate students could see their tax bill grow by 200 percent. It would also make it harder, and even impossible, for low or middle-income students to attend graduate school.

Vetri partnered with Kathy Shield, a fellow Cal student pursuing a Nuclear Engineering PhD to develop a tax calculator allowing any graduate student to determine their new tax liability under the House proposal. This allowed students to write and call their elected officials with specific information about the negative impact of the new tax bill.

And they didn’t stop there. Vetri and Kathy then organized graduate students at UC Berkeley and around the country to contact 87 offices in 18 states to express outrage over this provision.

Because of their great work this harmful provision was removed from the final bill. Vetri & Kathy have saved thousands of dollars for graduate students across the country, and have ensured many hard working students will continue to have access to graduate school.

On behalf of California’s 13th Congressional District, I’d like to thank Vetri and Kathy for their exceptional work to ensure all students have equal access to higher education, and most importantly for staying woke.

HAPPY 125TH ANNIVERSARY
ULVALDE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. WILL HURD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 125th Anniversary of Uvalde Volunteer Fire Department, a critical community institution and group of dedicated individuals in South Texas.

The Uvalde Volunteer Fire Department was founded in 1892, just 36 years after Uvalde County was established by Reading Wood Black, a twenty-two year old from New Jersey. In addition to fighting fires and educating the people of Uvalde on fire safety and prevention, this Department regularly participates in community events, like the Newspapers in Education and Christmas Posada and Parade, truly going the extra mile for public service.

Today I applaud the countless members of the Uvalde Volunteer Fire Department who have helped to keep Uvalde safe. The positive impact of this volunteer fire department resonates across Texas’ 23rd Congressional District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED HUFFMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 11, 2018, I was unavoidably detained for rolcall vote 14. Had I been present for rollcall vote 14, I would have voted “YEA”.

THANKING CHRISTIAN MORGAN
FOR HIS SERVICE TO MISSOURI’S 2ND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. ANN WAGNER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, today I include in the Record a tribute that means a great deal to me, my family, and my staff. Tomorrow we bid farewell to my Chief of Staff of five years, Christian Morgan.

Every day, Christian has exemplified the conservative principles for which my office fights. His love for his family, faith in Jesus Christ, and undying belief in what our country stands for have led my office from the day I was sworn in, and his presence will be felt...
long after his departure. Christian led by example; he was always the last to leave the office and the first to arrive. He guided, motivated, and empowered my staff and myself through fiscal cliffs, our historic fight against human trafficking, and countless pieces of legislation that improved our community in St. Louis.

I owe Christian a great debt of gratitude that I will never be able to fully repay, and today we bid him, the man who steered the ship, a fond farewell. It is a sendoff to a person who always kept a level head, was slow to anger, and quick to listen and lead with a spirit of humility. Christian truly embodies our guiding mission to serve a cause greater than oneself and be a voice for the most vulnerable. We wish him the very best moving forward, and we are grateful for Christian Morgan's service and sacrifice to our office, the Second District of Missouri, and our Great Nation.

May he always remember these words in Romans 5: 4–5, “Endurance produces character, and character produces hope, and hope does not put us to shame, because God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us.”
Thursday, January 11, 2018

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S143–S170

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2293–2305, and S. Res. 372–373.

Measures Passed:

Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act: Committee on Indian Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 984, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, and the bill was then passed.

Page S153

Congratulating the North Dakota State University football team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 372, congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2017 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title.

Page S170

Medal of Honor: Senate passed H.R. 4641, to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps.

Page S170

House Messages:

FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the amendment of the House to S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto:

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1870 (to the House Amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

McConnell Amendment No. 1871 (to Amendment No. 1870), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1872, to change the enactment date.

McConnell Amendment No. 1873 (to the instructions) Amendment No. 1872), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell Amendment No. 1874 (to Amendment No. 1873), of a perfecting nature.

A motion was entered to close further debate on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, January 16, 2018.

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 68 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. 10), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the House message to accompany the bill.

Pages S153–54

Prior to the consideration of this measure today, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

A unanimous consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 4:30 p.m., on Tuesday, January 16, 2018, Senate resume consideration of the amendment of the House to the bill; and that the filing deadlines under Rule XXII, with respect to the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, be at the following times on Tuesday, January 16, 2018: 4:45 p.m. for all first-degree amendments, and 5:15 p.m. for all second-degree amendments.

Pages S153–54

Appointments:

United States Semiquincentennial Commission: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law
114–196, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission: Rosa G. Rios of Maryland.

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By a unanimous vote of 92 yeas (Vote No. EX. 7), Michael Lawrence Brown, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. EX. 9), Walter David Counts III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 90 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 8), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

U.S. POLICY IN SYRIA POST-ISIS
Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States policy in Syria post-ISIS, after receiving testimony from David M. Satterfield, Senior Bureau Official for Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2152, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for assistance for victims of child pornography, with an amendment; and

The nominations of Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, and Joseph D. Brown, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas, Matthew D. Krueger, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Norman Euell Airflack, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and Ted G. Kamatchus, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Iowa, all of the Department of Justice.

INTELLIGENCE
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 4766–4784; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 98; and H. Res. 684–691 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4043, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to reauthorize the whistleblower protection program, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–510);

H.R. 1701, to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–511, Part 1);

H.R. 3737, to provide for a study on the use of social media in security clearance investigations (H. Rept. 115–512); and

H.R. 1532, to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of the Poarch Band
of Creek Indians, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–513).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Simpson to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Rapid DNA Act: The House passed S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, and to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, by a yea-and-nay vote of 256 yeas to 164 nays, Roll No. 16.

Rejected the Himes motion to commit the bill to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 15.

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–53 shall be considered as adopted.

Rejected:
Amash amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–504) that sought to replace the text of S. 139 with the text of the USA RIGHTS Act (by a yea-and-nay vote of 183 yeas to 233 nays, Roll No. 14).

H. Res. 682, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (S. 139) was agreed to yesterday, January 10th.

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, January 9th.


Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, January 12th and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourns to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, January 16th for Morning Hour debate.

Directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 78, directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139.

Committee Chairwoman Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Black wherein she resigned as the Chairwoman of the Committee on the Budget.

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Gowdy wherein he resigned from the Committee on Ethics.

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 685, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Senate Referral: S. 875 was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H160.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H157–58, H159, H159–160, and H160. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 12:31 p.m.

Committee Meetings
No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings
No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 2018
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House
No hearings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
1 p.m., Friday, January 12

Senate Chamber
Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Friday, January 12

House Chamber
Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 10 a.m.
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