



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2018

No. 19

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 29, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE JOHNSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

1984 IS 2018?

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recorded conversations, warrantless surveillance of citizens, and government invasion of privacy—it sounds like a page out of George Orwell's novel "1984." I don't know if you read this in high school or not, but my generation did. We never thought that this would ever take place in America. It is a book about Big Brother government.

To quote Orwell, here is what he says about government:

Always eyes watching you and the voice enveloping you. Asleep or awake, indoors or out of doors, in the bath or bed—no escape.

It talks about government eyes watching America. But it is happening here in America, Mr. Speaker, behind the closed doors of government intelligence and law enforcement agencies.

Big Brother, in my opinion, is watching. How? Through a piece of legislation called the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA. FISA allows our government to spy on foreign agents, including terrorists, primarily overseas. The government collects all of this information and puts it into a database. If government wants to use or search the database, they go to a secret FISA court, and that court issues a secret warrant to search the database.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade and a former judge and a prosecutor, I want government to go after terrorists overseas who seek to harm Americans; nab them, lock them up, and get rid of them.

What is of disturbing concern, Mr. Speaker, is government uses these database communications, texts, and emails of Americans to gain information on them and spy on them without a real probable cause warrant. That is one reason I did not vote to reauthorize FISA. This is a direct violation of Americans' Fourth Amendment rights.

For years, I have worked to rein in FISA's abuse of Americans' constitutional rights, and now we are learning more about FISA. And it is not good news.

Recently, Members of Congress were given access to a top secret memo by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence regarding the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. The memo outlines improper conduct of government, and its contents are extremely disturbing.

The Justice Department and the FBI oppose the release of this memo with-

out their permission. The Justice Department wants to black out, or redact, portions of it even though they haven't even seen the memo. They don't want the public to know what is in it. They think that the American people "can't handle the truth," to give a quote from Jack Nicholson.

The reality is these agencies would prefer to continue operating in secret, behind the closed, locked doors of intrigue and surveillance. Mr. Speaker, this is exactly why the memo should be released.

A transparent government, Mr. Speaker, is a good thing. That revolutionary idea sounds to me like something our Founders envisioned when they drafted the Fourth Amendment. Remember, the Bill of Rights was intended to protect us from government.

Despite the protests of those who wish to offer up our privacy on the altar of national security, keeping this memo secret does not make us any safer.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker: Release the memo to the press and to the public. Let the public and the media know what is happening by our government behind the dingy, dark rooms of secrecy. The memo is proof evident that government cannot be trusted.

Ironically, the new FISA bill signed into law attempts to protect Americans from foreign terrorists but denies Americans the right to have their privacy protected in our homeland. This is not the America our Founders envisioned.

The memo speaks for itself. Let the American people see the memo. Government has been watching America's conduct. Now it is time we watched the conduct of government.

As George Orwell said in his book "1984," in the eyes of Big Brother government, "Ignorance is strength."

Well, government may think so, but, Mr. Speaker, ignorance of the people is not a strength; it is a weakness. The

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H631

spying eyes and improper acts of Big Brother need to be revealed.

And that is just the way it is.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GROTHMAN) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You not only design but create. You sustain and shape what we know as reality. In Your hands, as the craftsman and artist, we are instruments for the time You have given us. Fitting into the palm of Your hand, we can accomplish Your will and produce what You have in mind for us, or we can prove unfit to achieve Your purpose for the tasks at hand.

Almighty God, help the Members of this people's House to see themselves as instruments in Your hands, shaping the time in which we live. As well, enable them to see in each other that same creative impulse and responsibility.

Only by relating to each other as Yours can we find our true identity, work together, and truly give You the greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania 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.

ADMINISTRATION'S IMMIGRATION PROPOSAL IS FLAWED

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the administration's immigration proposal is flawed. It doesn't include workforce verification, which would protect jobs for American workers and reduce illegal immigration.

The proposal grants amnesty to twice as many people as President Obama did. It gives amnesty today but delays legal immigration reforms until a distant tomorrow. For example, the elimination of chain migration won't occur for 17 years, if then.

The proposal is also ripe for fraud. Illegal immigrant adults can claim they arrived as children, but there is no practical way to confirm that.

The immigration plan is not a good deal for the American people. Immigration policy should put the interests of American workers first.

REBUILD AMERICA'S CRUMBLING INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow President Trump will give his first State of the Union Address. It is an opportunity for the President to demonstrate leadership and bring to this floor a discussion for both parties to come together and pass, number one, a long-term budget that reflects the priorities of the American people.

I have come to this floor many times to express my disagreement with this President on a number of issues. I have disagreed on his efforts to take away healthcare for millions of people, adding costs to people I represent who have health insurance. I have disagreed with his tax policies and disagree vehemently with the policies enacted here, and I am going to continue to speak up when I find disagreement.

But I also look for areas where we can work together, and it is my hope that tomorrow the President will articulate one of those: a plan to deal with America's crumbling infrastructure, especially in America's older cities. It has been over a year since the President was here and laid out his plan for a big investment plan and a strategy on infrastructure.

Words are cheap. We need action. We need something specific. And I am hoping and willing to work with the President if he lays forward such a vision.

CONGRATULATING LYN GARLING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate farmer-educator Lyn Garling for being selected as the 2018 recipient of the Pennsylvania Association for Sustainable Agriculture's PASAilities Award. The award honors businesses and indi-

viduals who make meaningful contributions to sustainable agriculture in the State and beyond.

For the past 20 years, Lyn Garling of Rebersburg has owned and operated Over the Moon Farm in Centre County. Over the Moon specializes in organic hay, broilers, hogs, and turkeys.

Lyn has traveled widely, teaching ecology in Nicaragua and conducting biological studies in Costa Rica and Mexico. She has earned her bachelor's degree in zoology and has worked on an 80-cow, 800-acre dairy farm in Colorado. She has spent decades as a program director for the Pennsylvania Integrated Pest Management Program at Penn State University, and she is widely known for helping growers at all scales understand and manage pests on their own operations.

Lyn has also worked as an independent organic inspector for Pennsylvania's Certified Organic and has served several terms on PASA's board of directors.

I wholeheartedly congratulate Lyn on this well-deserved recognition, and I thank her for all of her contributions to the industry.

PROTECTING VETERANS FROM DEPORTATION

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce my guest for the State of the Union, Marco Chavez. Marco Chavez is a veteran who served this country honorably, came home, and was deported to Mexico.

Mr. Chavez was born in Mexico. He was brought to California as an infant. He served in the Marine Corps as a lawful permanent resident before being deported. California Governor Brown granted him a full and unconditional pardon for a minor crime he had done, but he was separated from his family for 16 years.

It is an injustice that our veterans can go and serve overseas and that this is how we treat them when they come home after serving this country, many of whom put themselves in harm's way. That is why I have introduced the Veterans' Pathway to Citizenship Act, which will make it easier for deported veterans to return to the United States and ensures that Active-Duty servicemembers don't leave the military without understanding their options for naturalization.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 25, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 25, 2018, at 5:24 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1873.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) at 5 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE AND SAFE SPORT AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 534) to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 534

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 “Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE

Sec. 101. Required reporting of child and sexual abuse.

Sec. 102. Civil remedy for personal injuries.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES CENTER FOR SAFE SPORT AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 201. Expansion of the purposes of the corporation.

Sec. 202. Designation of the United States Center for Safe Sport.

Sec. 203. Additional requirements for granting sanctions for amateur athletic competitions.

Sec. 204. General requirements for youth-serving amateur sports organizations.

TITLE I—PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE

SEC. 101. REQUIRED REPORTING OF CHILD AND SEXUAL ABUSE.

(a) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 226 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “A person who” and inserting the following:

“(1) COVERED PROFESSIONALS.—A person who”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—A covered individual who learns of facts that give reason to suspect that a child has suffered an incident of child abuse, including sexual abuse, shall as soon as possible make a report of the suspected abuse to the agency designated by the Attorney General under subsection (d).”; (2) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)”; (3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end; (B) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and (C) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) the term ‘covered individual’ means an adult who is authorized, by a national governing body, a member of a national governing body, or an amateur sports organization that participates in interstate or international amateur athletic competition, to interact with a minor or amateur athlete at an amateur sports organization facility or at any event sanctioned by a national governing body, a member of a national governing body, or such an amateur sports organization; (10) the term ‘event’ includes travel, lodging, practice, competition, and health or medical treatment; (11) the terms ‘amateur athlete’, ‘amateur athletic competition’, ‘amateur sports organization’, ‘international amateur athletic competition’, and ‘national governing body’ have the meanings given the terms in section 220501(b) of title 36, United States Code; and (12) the term ‘as soon as possible’ means within a 24-hour period.”;

(4) in subsection (d), in the first sentence, by inserting “and for all covered individuals” after “reside”; (5) in subsection (f), in the first sentence—

(A) by striking “and on all” and inserting “on all”; and (B) by inserting “and for all covered individuals,” after “lands.”;

(6) in subsection (h), by inserting “and all covered individuals,” after “facilities.”; and (7) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require a victim of child abuse to self-report the abuse.”.

(b) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO REPORT.—Section 2258 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or a covered individual as described in subsection (a)(2) of such section 226 who,” after “facility.”.

SEC. 102. CIVIL REMEDY FOR PERSONAL INJURIES.

Section 2255 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who, while a minor, was a victim of a violation of section 1589, 1590, 1591, 2241(c), 2242, 2243, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2260, 2421, 2422, or 2423 of this title and who suffers personal injury as a result of such violation, regardless of whether the injury occurred while such person was a minor, may sue in any appropriate United States District Court and shall recover the actual damages such person sustains or liquidated damages in the amount of \$150,000, and the cost of the action, including reasonable attorney’s fees and other litigation costs reasonably incurred. The court may also award punitive damages and such other preliminary and equitable relief as the court determines to be appropriate.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “filed within” and all that follows through the end and inserting the following: “filed—

“(1) not later than 10 years after the date on which the plaintiff reasonably discovers the later of—

“(A) the violation that forms the basis for the claim; or

“(B) the injury that forms the basis for the claim; or

“(2) not later than 10 years after the date on which the victim reaches 18 years of age.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

“(1) VENUE.—Any action brought under subsection (a) may be brought in the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28.

“(2) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under subsection (a), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

“(A) is an inhabitant; or

“(B) may be found.”.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who, while a minor, was a victim of a violation of section 1589, 1590, 1591, 2241(c), 2242, 2243, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2260, 2421, 2422, or 2423 of this title and who suffers personal injury as a result of such violation, regardless of whether the injury occurred while such person was a minor, may sue in any appropriate United States District Court and shall recover the actual damages such person sustains or liquidated damages in the amount of \$150,000, and the cost of the action, including reasonable attorney’s fees and other litigation costs reasonably incurred. The court may also award punitive damages and such other preliminary and equitable relief as the court determines to be appropriate.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “filed within” and all that follows through the end and inserting the following: “filed—

“(1) not later than 10 years after the date on which the plaintiff reasonably discovers the later of—

“(A) the violation that forms the basis for the claim; or

“(B) the injury that forms the basis for the claim; or

“(2) not later than 10 years after the date on which the victim reaches 18 years of age.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

“(1) VENUE.—Any action brought under subsection (a) may be brought in the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28.

“(2) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under subsection (a), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

“(A) is an inhabitant; or

“(B) may be found.”.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES CENTER FOR SAFE SPORT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 201. EXPANSION OF THE PURPOSES OF THE CORPORATION.

Section 220503 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) to promote a safe environment in sports that is free from abuse, including emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, of any amateur athlete.”.

SEC. 202. DESIGNATION OF THE UNITED STATES CENTER FOR SAFE SPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2205 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Subchapter III—United States Center for Safe Sport

“§ 220541. Designation of United States Center for Safe Sport

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Center for Safe Sport shall—

“(1) serve as the independent national safe sport organization and be recognized worldwide as the independent national safe sport organization for the United States;

“(2) exercise jurisdiction over the corporation, each national governing body, and each paralympic sports organization with regard to safeguarding amateur athletes against abuse, including emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, in sports;

“(3) maintain an office for education and outreach that shall develop training, oversight practices, policies, and procedures to prevent the abuse, including emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, of amateur athletes participating in amateur athletic activities through national governing bodies and paralympic sports organizations;

“(4) maintain an office for response and resolution that shall establish mechanisms that allow for the reporting, investigation, and resolution, pursuant to subsection (c), of alleged sexual abuse in violation of the Center’s policies and procedures; and

“(5) ensure that the mechanisms under paragraph (4) provide fair notice and an opportunity to be heard and protect the privacy and safety of complainants.

“(b) **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—The policies and procedures developed under subsection (a)(3) shall apply as though they were incorporated in and made a part of section 220524 of this title.

“(c) **BINDING ARBITRATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Center may, in its discretion, utilize a neutral arbitration body and develop policies and procedures to resolve allegations of sexual abuse within its jurisdiction to determine the opportunity of any amateur athlete, coach, trainer, manager, administrator, or official, who is the subject of such an allegation, to participate in amateur athletic competition.

“(2) **PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed as altering, superseding, or otherwise affecting the right of an individual within the Center’s jurisdiction to pursue civil remedies through the courts for personal injuries arising from abuse in violation of the Center’s policies and procedures, nor shall the Center condition the participation of any such individual in a proceeding described in paragraph (1) upon an agreement not to pursue such civil remedies.

“(d) **LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an applicable entity shall not be liable for damages in any civil action for defamation, libel, slander, or damage to reputation arising out of any action or communication, if the action arises from the execution of the responsibilities or functions described in this section, section 220542, or section 220543.

“(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in any action in which an applicable entity acted with actual malice, or provided information or took action not pursuant to this section, section 220542, or section 220543.

“(3) **DEFINITION OF APPLICABLE ENTITY.**—In this subsection, the term ‘applicable entity’ means—

“(A) the Center;

“(B) a national governing body;

“(C) a paralympic sports organization;

“(D) an amateur sports organization or other person sanctioned by a national governing body under section 220525;

“(E) an amateur sports organization reporting under section 220530;

“(F) any officer, employee, agent, or member of an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E); and

“(G) any individual participating in a proceeding pursuant to this section.

“§ 220542. Additional duties.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Center shall—

“(1) develop training, oversight practices, policies, and procedures for implementation by a national governing body or paralympic sports organization to prevent the abuse, including emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, of any amateur athlete; and

“(2) include in the policies and procedures developed under section 220541(a)(3)—

“(A) a requirement that all adult members of a national governing body, a paralympic sports organization, or a facility under the jurisdiction of a national governing body or paralympic sports organization, and all adults authorized by such members to interact with an amateur athlete, report immediately any allegation of child abuse of an amateur athlete who is a minor to—

“(i) the Center, whenever such members or adults learn of facts leading them to suspect reasonably that an amateur athlete who is a minor has suffered an incident of child abuse; and

“(ii) law enforcement consistent with section 226 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20341);

“(B) a mechanism, approved by a trained expert on child abuse, that allows a complainant to report easily an incident of child abuse to the Center, a national governing body, law enforcement authorities, or other appropriate authorities;

“(C) reasonable procedures to limit one-on-one interactions between an amateur athlete who is a minor and an adult (who is not the minor’s legal guardian) at a facility under the jurisdiction of a national governing body or paralympic sports organization without being in an observable and interruptible distance from another adult, except under emergency circumstances;

“(D) procedures to prohibit retaliation, by any national governing body or paralympic sports organization, against any individual who makes a report under subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B);

“(E) oversight procedures, including regular and random audits conducted by subject matter experts unaffiliated with, and independent of, a national governing body or a paralympic sports organization of each national governing body and paralympic sports organization to ensure that policies and procedures developed under that section are followed correctly and that consistent training is offered and given to all adult members who are in regular contact with amateur athletes who are minors, and subject to parental consent, to members who are minors, regarding prevention of child abuse; and

“(F) a mechanism by which a national governing body or paralympic sports organization can—

“(i) share confidentially a report of suspected child abuse of an amateur athlete who is a minor by a member of a national governing body or paralympic sports organization, or an adult authorized by a national governing body, paralympic sports organization, or an amateur sports organization to interact with an amateur athlete who is a minor, with the Center, which in turn, may share with relevant national governing bodies, paralympic sports organizations, and other entities; and

“(ii) withhold providing to an adult who is the subject of an allegation of child abuse authority to interact with an amateur athlete who is a minor until the resolution of such allegation.

“(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the ability of a national governing body or paralympic sports organization to impose an interim measure to prevent an individual who is the subject of an allegation of sexual abuse from interacting with an amateur athlete prior to the Center exercising its jurisdiction over a matter.

“§ 220543. Records, audits, and reports

“(a) **RECORDS.**—The Center shall keep correct and complete records of account.

“(b) **REPORT.**—The Center shall submit an annual report to Congress, including—

“(1) an audit conducted and submitted in accordance with section 10101; and

“(2) a description of the activities of the Center.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 220501(b) of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (8) as paragraphs (6) through (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3), the following:

“(4) ‘Center’ means the United States Center for Safe Sport designated under section 220541.

“(5) ‘child abuse’ has the meaning given the term in section 212 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20302).”.

(c) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of chapter 2205 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER III — UNITED STATES CENTER
FOR SAFE SPORT

“220541. Designation of United States Center for Safe Sport.

“220542. Additional duties.

“220543. Records, audits, and reports.”.

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANTING SANCTIONS FOR AMATEUR ATHLETIC COMPETITIONS.

Section 220525(b)(4) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) the amateur sports organization or person requesting sanction from a national governing body will implement and abide by the policies and procedures to prevent the abuse, including emotional, physical, and child abuse, of amateur athletes participating in amateur athletic activities applicable to such national governing body.”.

SEC. 204. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR YOUTH-SERVING AMATEUR SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter II of chapter 2205 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 220530. Other amateur sports organizations

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An applicable amateur sports organization shall—

“(1) comply with the reporting requirements of section 226 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20341);

“(2) establish reasonable procedures to limit one-on-one interactions between an amateur athlete who is a minor and an adult (who is not the minor’s legal guardian) at a facility under the jurisdiction of the applicable amateur sports organization without being in an observable and interruptible distance from another adult, except under emergency circumstances;

“(3) offer and provide consistent training to all adult members who are in regular contact with amateur athletes who are minors, and subject to parental consent, to members who are minors, regarding prevention and reporting of child abuse to allow a complainant to report easily an incident of child abuse to appropriate persons; and

“(4) prohibit retaliation, by the applicable amateur sports organization, against any individual who makes a report under paragraph (1).

“(b) **DEFINITION OF APPLICABLE AMATEUR SPORTS ORGANIZATION.**—In this section, the term ‘applicable amateur sports organization’ means an amateur sports organization—

“(1) that is not otherwise subject to the requirements under subchapter III;

“(2) that participates in an interstate or international amateur athletic competition; and

“(3) whose membership includes any adult who is in regular contact with an amateur athlete who is a minor.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of chapter 2205 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 220529 the following:

“220530. Other amateur sports organizations.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 534, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that today we are voting on S. 534, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017. This important legislation protects child athletes from both sexual and physical abuse.

Over the past year, the Nation was horrified to learn of the decades of abuse that occurred within USA Gymnastics by Dr. Larry "Lecherous" Nassar. The middle name was added by me, Mr. Speaker. Last week, Nassar was sentenced to between 40 and 175 years' incarceration after pleading guilty to several counts of sexual assault.

Over 150 women and girls gave victim impact statements. How a serial predator like Dr. Nassar could have preyed on so many young girls for such a long time in such a flagrant fashion is appalling.

Our amateur gymnasts were failed. They were failed by the very people who are supposed to protect them and do no harm, as doctors are supposed to do.

In the past weeks, we have not only seen Dr. Nassar brought to justice, but we have also seen many others held accountable for their roles of commission and omission associated with these atrocities. Though we are glad to see justice finally served in this case, we must take appropriate measures to prevent this from occurring again. This bill will do that.

Under current law, the Victims of Child Abuse Act requires persons engaged in certain activities and professions on Federal lands or in Federal facilities to report child abuse. Failure to report could subject such persons to criminal penalties.

This bill expands these mandatory reporting requirements to adults working at national governing boards, that is, amateur sports organizations recognized by the United States Olympic Committee, such as USA Gymnastics or USA Tennis, or at sanctioned events. The bill also charters a new organization called Safe Sport, tasked with preventing child abuse within the national governing bodies through education and handling reports of misconduct.

Safe Sport will assure these national governing bodies abide by such policies and procedures to assure that predators like Dr. Nassar will never again be permitted to terrorize young athletes with impunity.

I would like to thank Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana for her hard work on this issue and for assembling a bipartisan team of cosponsors. Protecting our young people, including those who have sacrificed so much to represent the United States, such as Olympic athletes, is and should be a bipartisan undertaking.

I commend my colleagues for their support, and I urge them to vote in favor of S. 534.

Mr. Speaker, I have 133 victim impact statements of young women that were made at this sentencing, and I want to read just a few phrases from some of these strong athletes who had the courage to come forward and tell what Dr. Nassar did to them.

The first one is from Donna Markham. Donna's daughter Chelsey was an athlete under the supervision of Nassar. She could not give a victim impact statement, and here is why, according to her mother, Donna: "In 2009, she took her own life. She couldn't deal with the pain anymore. Every day I miss her. It all started with him."

Danielle Moore: "I hope being reduced to a prison number"—she is talking to Nassar—"will define you as it defined me for so many years. I will no longer be known as a number, and I will be Dr. Danielle Moore."

Megan Halicek: "As I stand here, I still flash back to the feelings of fear, laying frozen in his office, my sweating, shaking body, adrenaline pumping, painfully clutching the sides of the table, waiting for the sick treatment to be over."

Gwen Anderson: "I still remember him saying, 'It's okay. I know you're not used to being touched there, but it will feel better.'"

And here is what Gwen's coach had to say, Thomas Brennan: "For the record, go to hell. . . . What you did to everyone else who trusted you and sent girls your way is disgusting, reprehensible, unforgivable."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 534, the Protecting Young Victims From Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017, but I thank my colleagues here in the House, Congresswoman Brooks and Congresswoman FRANKEL of Florida.

In Michigan, there was a volcanic action. One might call it the "Nassar volcano." It acted, and there was no reaction. It was deadening silence. No one responded to the volcano that kept pouring poisonous lava in the way of young, beautiful athletes.

I would hope and wish that I was not on the floor today with my colleague

from Texas having to discuss this life-changing experience for these young athletes who wanted to do nothing else but to make their families proud first, maybe exceed, and be able to adhere to their faith, determination, and resolve and make their Nation, their State, their school proud of them, young girls, women, who, heretofore, Mr. Speaker, had been held back or told that this sport was not for them.

I am reminded of the women's hockey team, and I heard a young hockey player indicate that her grandmother said that hockey was not for girls.

All they wanted to do was to make us proud. All they wanted to do is to show the strength of women and the resolve of women. That is why I think this bill not only is important, Mr. Speaker, but it is timely to come today; but all of us would have wished, with no condemnation, that we had it 5 years ago or 10 years ago.

But remember what I said: the volcanic action was faced with deafening silence, for those who knew and for the girls who wanted to make us proud thought that the best way to resolve it or to handle it was to embrace it, accept it, suffer, and still make us proud.

That is why I believe this bill is crucial, and I am very glad to be on the floor with the two House sponsors, and I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for her efforts, because this bill would prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities.

This is a reasonable and important measure that is intended to protect young athletes—and listen to the sound of the volcano—from abuse and preserve the sanctity of sports associated with the U.S. Olympic Committee, the organization responsible for preparing and training young athletes who might one day represent our Nation competitively all over the world.

How proud we are as we sit and view them on the Nation's televisions, the Summer Olympics and the Winter Olympics that are about to start. How shameful it is that we have to have this legislation to protect them and, as well, the deadening silence at Michigan State University and Dr. Nassar. I guess the only words that he could say are how ashamed and embarrassed and sorry he is.

Eons and eons and eons of young women now live with that pain. Children deserve to fully enjoy the innocence of their youth by exploring the curiosities of the world, taking pleasure in the art, participating in sports free of abuse.

Yes, I am going to defend the parents. I know some of them are overly eager. We have seen them at Little League, and we have seen them at football competition for little ones and middle school and high school, and they are overly enthusiastic. You can't condemn a parent for being proud of their child. And if that child wants to be engaged in sports, you can't condemn that parent for trying to get

them the best doctor and best instructor. Those parents were not protected—deafening silence.

Sexual abuse of children and youth is an abhorrent practice that is intolerable in any context, and we must take appropriate measures to eliminate it from youth sports. Young people look to adults to protect them and keep them safe. We all have a responsibility to do so. With S. 534, we have an opportunity to ensure that individuals abide by this duty.

Certain other professionals, such as doctors, dentists, social workers, psychologists, teachers, and daycare workers, are already bound by law to report suspected abuse to law enforcement. Finally, S. 534 will require the same of adults who interact with young athletes in connection with sports activities organized by the national governing bodies of various sports.

The urgent need for this legislation is best illustrated by the horrible abuse and exploitation of numerous young gymnasts at the hands of Dr. Larry Nassar, who victimized young athletes participating in USA Gymnastics over the course of 20 years—20 years, two decades.

All of our hearts should break. In those 20 years, there were lives ruined. They will never be the vibrant, excited young women that they were as they entered this wonderful experience of showing their prowess, their genius, and their strength. The stories of abuse and suffering of these young women are heartbreaking.

Many complaints of sexual and emotional abuse by Nassar and others went unreported for years, allowing coaches, instructors, and doctors to repeatedly victimize gymnasts as young as 6 years old. The shocking failure of anyone to report accusations to law enforcement or even keep track of complaints internally made it possible for some of these predators to commit multiple horrific acts over time. We entrust the care of our children and young athletes to those we hope will uphold the trust and not abuse it.

One of the more than 150 girls and women victimized by Dr. Nassar was recently quoted as saying:

He has everything he needs to be an incredible leader. He has the personality, the skill, and the knowledge, and he's using it to prey on people. What a waste.

Last week, a Michigan judge sentenced Nassar to a prison sentence of up to 175 years. The judge called Nassar's assaults on scores of girls and women under the pretense that he was treating them as "precise, calculated, manipulative, devious, despicable." She also indicated what a debasing human being he was and is.

We must continue to do more to help protect our young athletes, and this bill will greatly assist in that effort. However, I must note a concern with a change the bill before us would make to the Senate-passed version of S. 534.

The bill unanimously passed by the Senate would authorize funding to be

provided to the U.S. Center for Safe Sport in the amount of \$1 million for each of the next 4 years. Unfortunately, the version of the bill before us strips this funding authorization. I believe we should have taken up the Senate bill without amendment.

Safe Sport is charged with important responsibilities under this bill with respect to receiving and investigating all allegations of abuse and setting policies to prevent future abuse, so this bill has taken out that language from the Senate.

□ 1715

It is critical that we ensure that the center is provided the resources for those things to be done immediately. By doing so, I hope we will prevent the type of abuse and suffering perpetrated by the people like Larry Nassar.

In a recent open letter from the U.S. Olympians and Paralympians Association to athletes everywhere, they wrote:

The goal of Olympianism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, womankind, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity. Now we must ask: How can athlete dignity be preserved when the responsible institutions fail so in their oversight?

In an apology letter to Team USA from the United States Olympic Committee issued last week, the committee admitted that they had failed these young athletes.

Frankly, I believe that whole committee and system should be overhauled, reviewed, inspected, and changed. While the USA Gymnastics scandal is unfortunate, let it be an example and an incentive to prevent such abuse from happening in the nooks and crannies of this Nation, in the villages and cities and counties where young people who are starry-eyed and ready to accept the leadership of an adult are ready to show their proudness as well as their talent, their strength, and their resolve. I hope that we will never end that here in America.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation. I hope we will see fit to fund it.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Texas. Just so it is clear, I agree with her on the money. It should have been funded, but it was ruled an earmark, and we can't do earmarks anymore. We have to go through another process to get that funding. A good reason why we ought to have earmarks.

Mr. Speaker, Amanda Barterian said this at the sentencing hearing: "I refuse to let Larry Nassar take anything more from here. He has already taken enough."

Nicole Walker said this at the sentencing hearing: "I have anxiety and sleep disorders all because of what you"—Nassar—"did to me."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), a former U.S. attorney.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, S. 534.

I also want to thank my colleague from the other side of the aisle, the co-chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues that I co-chair, Representative LOIS FRANKEL from Florida, for helping me get this bill to this point and for helping us support Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator THUNE as they move the bill in the Senate.

In less than 2 weeks, over 200 American athletes will represent our Nation at the highest levels of sport in the 2018 Olympic Winter Games in PyeongChang.

These athletes have prepared their entire lives for these games, and their performances are a result of countless hours of practice, self-discipline, and sacrifice.

Tragically, we have also learned that many of our young athletes have been subjected to sexual abuse at the hands of those who were supposed to be supporting them reach their Olympic goals.

We have seen more than 156 women use their voices to share their agonizing stories of sexual abuse at the hands of a doctor they and their parents were told to trust, Dr. Larry Nassar.

Their decision to publicly reveal their traumatic experiences is nothing short of heroic, and it was instrumental in ensuring that Nassar will never again touch another young athlete.

Now, after a 2016 Indianapolis Star investigation exposed what is now known as the worst sexual abuse scandal in athletics to date, we are taking action to prevent this heinous action from ever taking place again.

Today, the House will vote on the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017. This bipartisan legislation mandates training, increases requirements for reporting abuse, and reforms a broken system that has failed too many victims.

This bill requires any individual who interacts with our amateur athletes to report suspected child abuse, including sexual abuse, within 24 hours. If they fail to do so, they will be held accountable by the new law.

To prevent future emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, this bill designates the United States Center for Safe Sport to develop, implement, and enforce policies, procedures, and mandatory training for national governing bodies and their members.

The center will ensure that, when reports of abuse are made, they are investigated. It protects those who report abuse from retaliation. As commonsense would dictate, it requires that, until the investigation is closed, an adult who is subject to allegations

of abuse against a minor is prohibited from interacting with minors.

As the Nassar sentencings come to a close and the Olympic games quickly approach, we are reminded of the importance of protecting the safety and well-being of all of our athletes.

Today, we are strengthening protections for victims to ensure transparency and accountability, and putting the safety and the health of our athletes and every young athlete who has ever dreamed of the Olympic stage first.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for consideration of this bill and I urge my colleagues to pass the Senate bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), the cosponsor of the House bill, and I thank her for her leadership on these issues.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. POE and Ms. JACKSON LEE for leading this debate today. And, of course, I want to thank Susan Brooks, my co-chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, for her support. This is an example of bipartisanship at its best. And, of course, I also thank DIANNE FEINSTEIN over in the Senate, whose bill we are taking up, our companion bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act. It is a long name, but it is important. It came about on the heels of reports of sexual abuse at the highest levels of USA Gymnastics.

Me Too has come to the Olympics, and we have heard from more than 150 very brave young women, extraordinary not only in their talent but in their courage, who have shared their harrowing stories of sexual abuse at the hands of a doctor, Larry Nassar, who they were told to trust.

One of these stories is from Mattie Larson, who was a budding young gymnast and a future Olympic medalist. At age 14, she hurt her hip and was sent to Dr. Nassar, the well-known and now disgraced doctor who cared for hundreds of athletes like Mattie.

Instead of healing her hip, he crippled her mind. For 5 years, this doctor molested this young woman. She became so desperate at one point that she feigned a slip and fall and a concussion just to try to get out of ever going back to the Olympic facility.

Mattie said: "... I just couldn't take any more abuse. I was broken. Larry, my coaches, and USA Gymnastics turned the sport I fell in love with as a kid into my personal living hell."

These children are children, like Mattie, who want to represent our country and who give up so much of their childhood, getting up early, practicing hard, on weekends going to competitions, and then only to be subjected to sexual abuse by the team doctor, and then either ignored or encouraged to keep silent.

I say shame, shame, shame on those who enabled this.

It may be too late to protect Mattie and Olympic stars like Aly Raisman, but this legislation, by requiring proper reporting and notifying procedures, will protect our future young athletes. I urge my colleagues to support this very, very good bipartisanship legislation.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Katherine Gordon said this at the sentencing: "Sexual assault is distant until you realize each girl in the news is a broken mirror."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Bishop).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 534, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for giving me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, last week was a tough week in my district and in our country. In a courtroom in Lansing, Michigan, 156 victims, one by one, bravely faced depraved sexual predator Larry Nassar to recount their personal story of unimaginable and despicable atrocities.

As we now know, reports of sexual misconduct were routinely dismissed or flatly ignored by the management of USA Gymnastics. As a direct result, hundreds of young women, all of whom relied on these trusted professionals all around them, were sexually assaulted under the guise of medical treatment.

The court did its part this week and sentenced Nassar to a maximum prison term where he will spend the rest of his life. But the investigation continues and others will be held accountable in days to come.

For our part during this process, Members of Congress must do everything in their power to ensure that this never happens again. With that as our objective, I believe this bill takes a dramatic step in the right direction.

Now, I must say in all candor, I stand before you today in absolute disbelief; disbelief in the layers of mismanagement that should have prevented this from happening, but also disbelief that it takes an act of Congress to ensure a congressionally chartered organization fulfill its obligation to care for and protect the young athletes with whom their parents have entrusted.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my constituents in offering our heartfelt prayers to the victims and their families for the nightmare that they have experienced.

To all of you: Please know my colleagues and I will do everything in our power to be your strong advocate and to ensure justice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to advocate and support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we have listened to various speakers, I am glad that we are joined by men and women of the United States Congress. All of us have indi-

cated the sadness in which we do this now.

But I think it is also important to take note of the fact of individuals who have to be held responsible. We know that the president of the university was asked to resign, or in fact has resigned. As we go forward, there will be others as well.

This should be the clarion call, even as this legislation is passed and signed by the President, for all of these agencies and associations that run sports for children to do their own vetting and internal assessment of individuals who are not there for the benefit of children but are there for the benefit of themselves.

156-plus women were molested by this doctor. One of the victims said something that stops your breath. This could have been stopped in 1997, more than 20 years ago.

So this legislation should move swiftly to the President's desk.

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

□ 1730

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership as well as the author, Mrs. BROOKS, for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act. In the wake of the horrendous revelations of sexual abuse brought to the forefront by the recent USA Gymnastics case, it is clear that measures do need to be put in place to protect young athletes and keep them safe.

No child should ever be put in the position of having their innocence robbed from them, which is why we need to have the highest protections of the law from those looking to exploit them and take advantage of their vulnerability.

I would encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan bill which will require amateur athletic-governing bodies to immediately report sex abuse allegations to local or Federal law enforcement and also to make it safe and easy for victims to report that abuse.

As the Olympics approach, there is no doubt, we will all be reminded, unfortunately, of the recent sexual abuse case that took place with the gymnastics team. But this is our opportunity to take action, to do everything in our power to make sure that this does not happen again, and to protect all of our young and future athletes, giving them the confidence that they will never be put in a situation where an adult or someone who may have inappropriate intentions does not have the ability to do so.

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

Mr. Speaker, when I read the quote from the accuser who said this could have been stopped in 1997, the article's headline was that eight times Larry Nassar could have been stopped. Eight times. So it is important to take note of this legislation as a clarion call, and these words are most important.

This provision makes it unlawful for an adult who is authorized by a national governing body, a member of a national governing body, or an amateur sports organization that participates in interstate or international amateur athletic competition to interact with a minor or amateur athlete at specific events to fail to report as soon as possible child and sexual abuse to local law enforcement or another agency.

Many times members of the Judiciary Committee don't like wide nets. We have a responsibility to adhere to the Constitution. But we are the committee that has the responsibility of upholding the rule of law. And to all of those who are now in this wide net, that is the rule of law: to be able to protect our children against massive sexual abuse as they pursue their dreams.

Just a comment, the requirement would arise on a person that learns of the facts that give reason to suspect that a child has suffered an incident of child abuse, including sexual abuse; and, therefore, those who can say or attempt to say, "I couldn't understand what the child was saying; it wasn't clear," but if they got a sense that there was a problem, they come under that net. I believe that that is appropriate.

Let me also indicate that there is a long list of heroes who have been impacted by Dr. Nassar. My constituent stated, on January 16, a former Olympic gymnast who wowed the world, Simone Biles, said that she was abused by Dr. Nassar.

The long list of Dr. Nassar's victims include U.S. Olympic gymnasts McKayla Maroney, Aly Raisman, and Gabby Douglas. They represented the country and made us proud. And can you imagine? They were abused. Let me thank the many organizations that have worked hard to advance this legislation, including Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, RAINN, the Nation's largest antisexual violence organization. They have been magnificent.

I include in the RECORD a number of letters, Mr. Speaker, because each day approximately 600 individuals are affected by sexual violence, most of whom are children or parents seeking support, and they are served by this organization.

The first letter I include in the RECORD supporting this legislation is from RAINN, which urges the House of Representatives and others to pass this legislation so that it can move quickly into the position to be signed by the President.

RAINN,

Washington, DC, November 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives.
Hon. JOHN THUNE,
U.S. Senate.

Hon. SUSAN BROOKS,
House of Representatives.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.
Hon. STENY HOYER,
House of Representatives.
Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate.
Hon. LOIS FRANKEL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR HOUSE AND SENATE LEADERS: RAINN, the nation's largest anti-sexual violence organization, urges the House of Representatives to pass the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act.

Every two minutes in America, someone is sexually assaulted. Every eight minutes, that individual is a child. The Senate-passed bill, which has RAINN's support and reflects months of bipartisan work and deliberation, is an important step forward in ensuring that young athletes can train and compete in the safe environments they deserve. The legislation strengthens and streamlines the process for reporting abuse of amateur athletes, and requires officials and coaches who work with prospective Olympians to undergo training on sexual abuse.

Survivors are reaching out to RAINN, which operates the National Sexual Assault Hotline, in record numbers. There has been a 21 percent increase in those contacting our hotline. Each day, RAINN's victim service programs provide support to approximately 600 individuals affected by sexual violence, assisting a record 19,432 people in October alone. Many who contact the Hotline are children or parents seeking support.

We urge the House of Representatives to advance this legislation, as passed by the Senate, without delay. Doing so will demonstrate a commitment to ensuring young athletes who dream of representing our nation at the highest levels can achieve their goals safely and in a respectful environment.

Thank you and please do not hesitate to contact RAINN with questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

REBECCA W. O'CONNOR, Esq.,
Vice President of Public Policy.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, every 2 minutes in America, someone is sexually assaulted; every 8 minutes, that individual is a child.

Let me include in the RECORD a letter from the U.S. Olympians and Paralympians Association, and I would like to call out their names. These are all athletes: Dick Fosbury, track and field; Willie Banks, track and field; Allison Baver, speedskating; Carol Brown, rowing; Candace Cable, Paralympic track and field; Caryn Davies, rowing; Gary Hall, Sr., swimming; Micki King, diving; Carol Lewis, track and field; John Naber, swimming; Bill Toomey, track and field; Iris Zimmerman, fencing.

U.S. OLYMPIANS & PARALYMPIANS
ASSOCIATION.

An open letter from the U.S. Olympians and Paralympians Association to athletes everywhere:

We hear you.

We have heard your many stories detailing the sexual and emotional abuse you endured while training and competing in pursuit of your goals and your dreams. We applaud your individual and collective courage and conviction in coming forward and telling all . . . and calling out those who abused your trust.

We are both appalled by the actions of those who hurt you and deeply saddened by your suffering. For those whose stories we haven't heard (and may never hear), we respect your decision and your privacy . . . but also acknowledge the pain you feel in silence.

We are united in saying that there is no place for abuse in sport—at any age, at any level, in any venue. As Olympic and Paralympic alumni, we want you to know we are a family that stands strong for the ideals of the Olympic and Paralympic movements.

When we, as athletes, returned from past Games, we shared an understanding that "The goal of Olympism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity." Now we must ask how can athlete dignity be preserved when the responsible institutions fail so in their oversight?

So what shall we do? We shall continue to advocate for education and safe sport, to teach young boys and girls to recognize the signs of abuse and provide a safe place to speak without repercussion. Parents, coaches and trainers need to be educated to recognize the signs and learn how to behave properly in coaching situations. We shall support Title IX, the U.S. Center for SafeSport and pending federal legislation to protect our athletes.

For any of you who are currently in need (or know someone who is), the newly created and independent U.S. Center for SafeSport is available for confidential 24/7 reporting and crisis support:

SafeSport.org

24/7 SafeSport Crisis Helpline 866-200-0796

We know the power of commitment to a belief and to goals; our goal is that your experiences are never repeated. Together, we shall seek to create a way of life based on the joy of effort.

Together in sport,

United States Olympians and Paralympians Association Executive Committee

President Dick Fosbury—Track and Field, 1968

Willie Banks—Track and Field, 1980/1984/1988

Allison Baver—Speedskating, 2002/2006/2010

Carol Brown—Rowing 1976/1980/1984

Candace Cable—Paralympic Track and Field, 1980/1988/1992/1996, Alpine Skiing, 1992; Nordic Skiing, 1994/1998/2002/2006

Caryn Davies—Rowing, 2004/2008/2012

Gary Hall Sr.—Swimming, 1968/1972/1976

Micki King—Diving, 1968/1972

Carol Lewis—Track and Field, 1980/1984/1988

John Naber—Swimming, 1976

Bill Toomey—Track and Field, 1968

Iris Zimmerman—Fencing, 2000

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, likewise, I include in the RECORD a letter, dated November 16, 2017, from the CWLA, Child Welfare League of America, an organization that worked on this issue.

CWLA,

Washington, DC, November 16, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives.
Hon. JOHN THUNE,
U.S. Senate.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.
Hon. STENY HOYER,
House of Representatives.
Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, LEADER PELOSI, CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY, CONGRESSMAN HOYER, SENATOR THUNE, AND SENATOR FEINSTEIN:

The Child Welfare League of America, after months of bipartisan work and deliberation, urges the House of Representatives to pass the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act.

This bipartisan legislation has now passed the Senate and we firmly believe it will help to address some of the recent reports of child sexual abuse that occurred against some of this nation's finest young athletes while training for the United States Olympic team. Based on past history and reports, CWLA believes that stronger legislative action is required so that this history does not continue to repeat itself.

Over these past several months we have been able to work with key congressional offices to enhance the responsibility and the accountability of U.S. Olympic organizations. Several parts of this bill, including the authorization and funding for the U.S. Center for Safe Sport, are critical to this accountability.

We hope the House of Representatives will act without delay so parents and young athletes can live out their dreams of competing on behalf of this country and do so with the assurance they will be safe and respected.

Thank you for your attention on behalf of children.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE JAMES-BROWN,
President/CEO, Child
Welfare League of
America.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the DC Coalition Against Domestic Violence. They have worked along with RAINN and have emphasized that the Nation's youngest have been impacted by this dastardly series of actions.

DC COALITION AGAINST
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE,

Washington, DC, November 20, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.
Hon. SUSAN BROOKS,
House of Representatives.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives.
Hon. JOHN THUNE,
U.S. Senate.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.
Hon. LOIS FRANKEL,
House of Representatives.
Hon. STENY HOYER,
House of Representatives.
Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, LEADER PELOSI, MS. BROOKS, MS. FRANKEL, MR. MCCARTHY, MR. HOYER, MR. THUNE, AND MS. FEINSTEIN:

The DC Coalition Against Domestic Violence urges the House of Representatives to pass the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act.

This bipartisan legislation is imperative to respond to the numerous disclosures of child sexual abuse by our nation's youngest and most accomplished athletes while they were training for the U.S. Olympics. Intervention and prevention measures through this legislation are desperately needed to keep our children safe and hold offenders and entities accountable for their actions and their silence. Authorization and funding for the U.S. Center for Safe Sport will be the first significant step toward this goal.

We ask the House of Representatives to swiftly and expeditiously pass this legislation to protect our young athletes and show them they are valued and deserve to excel in their chosen sport without fear of and violence from those they trust.

Thank you for your commitment to ending sexual abuse, please do not hesitate to contact our office if we can be of further assistance in this charge.

Sincerely,

KARMA COTTMAN,
Executive Director.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Professor Emeritus Howard M. Rubin from DePaul University who speaks about sexual abuse. "My wife, Barbara Blaine, knew the lasting damage that is caused when a child is abused having been a child victim."

DEPAUL UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LAW,

Chicago, Illinois, November 16, 2017.

Re: SB.534/ HR 1973—Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act of 2017

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Senator JOHN THUNE,
Representative SUSAN BROOKS,
Representative LOIS FRANKEL.

DEAR LAWMAKERS: I am writing to enthusiastically support S.534/HR 1973 and to express my appreciation for your work in drafting and advancing this legislation. In the wake of the deluge of sexual harassment scandals breaking on a daily basis, the American public is crying out for recognition of women's rights, and the rights of victims of sexual abuse and harassment.

While there is no way to quantify the struggles of one victim against another a young victim's childhood is indelibly harmed by sexual abuse. My wife, Barbara Blaine, knew the lasting damage that is caused when a child is abused having been a child victim. For her entire adult life she fought selflessly and tirelessly to ensure the safety and well-being of survivors, to prevent children from suffering abuse, and to hold accountable those responsible. Abusers and their enablers utilizing their power and status as shields against prosecution and retribution were dragged out into the light of justice and accountability by Barbara's ceaseless crusade as advocate.

One of Barbara's passions was confronting unfair statute of limitations. They protected abusers and punished young victims unable to confront their abuse till later in life. The language in S.534 that extends statute of limitations for victims of child sexual abuse pertaining to federal crimes is a tribute to her efforts.

Barbara cast a bright light against the darkness, but tragically, her flame was snuffed out far too soon. She left this world suddenly and before she could finish her life's work. It is upon us now to stoke the embers left in the wake of that lifetime, that

her legacy might live on forever through S.534, and cast such a spark so as to permanently light the way towards justice for those who have been abused.

I would consider it an honor to be included in the list of supporters for S.534.

Sincerely,

HOWARD M RUBIN,
Professor Emeritus.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Children's Alliance, which has been working with other advocacy groups and, again, has done longstanding work against child abuse, supporting this legislation.

NATIONAL CHILDREN ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, November 20, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
U.S. House of Representatives.
Hon. JOHN THUNE,
U.S. Senate.
Hon. SUSAN BROOKS,
House of Representatives.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.
Hon. STENY HOYER,
House of Representatives.
Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate.
Hon. LOIS FRANKEL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI:
DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY AND CONGRESSMAN HOYER:

DEAR SENATOR THUNE AND SENATOR FEINSTEIN:

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BROOKS AND CONGRESSWOMAN FRANKEL: The National Children's Alliance, in cooperation with numerous other advocacy groups, encourages the House of Representatives to pass the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act (S.534).

Having recently passed the Senate, this bipartisan legislation seeks to address the numerous reports of childhood sexual abuse that have occurred against our nation's young athletes. The recent press surrounding the United States' Olympic trainees only serves to heighten the need for a strong legislative response.

The NCA's longstanding work on child abuse leads us to believe that this legislation will increase the accountability of U.S. Olympic organizations and help ensure that incidences of this nature are not repeated. In particular, authorization and funding for the U.S. Center for Safe Sport is one of the critical provisions of this bill that will actively enhance U.S. Olympic organizations' responsibility in these matters. It establishes an office for education and outreach to develop the appropriate training, policies, and procedures to combat and prevent the emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, of young athletes competing in athletic activities sponsored by national governing bodies and Paralympic sports organizations.

We hope that the House of Representatives will take swift action and stand with us in ensuring that our young athletes are protected as they strive to compete on behalf of our nation.

Thank you for your consideration of our youth.

Sincerely,

TERESA HUIZAR,
Executive Director,
National Children's Alliance.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. CHILD USA: Let's End Child Abuse and Neglect said

in a letter, which I include in the RECORD: “This bill would shine much needed sunlight on the problem of abuse in sports. It will protect children in the future.”

CHILD USA,
November 20, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives.

Hon. JOHN THUNE,
U.S. Senate.

Hon. SUSAN BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
House of Representatives.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate.

Hon. LOIS FRANKEL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, LEADER PELOSI, CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY, CONGRESSMAN HOYER, SENATOR THUNE, SENATOR FEINSTEIN, CONGRESSWOMAN BROOKS, and CONGRESSWOMAN FRANKEL:

CHILD USA urges the House of Representatives to pass the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act. This bill would shine much needed sunlight on the problem of abuse in sports. It will protect children in the future.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, institutes important and minimally necessary measures to ensure the protection of children from abuse in sports: (1) mandatory reporting of child abuse to SafeSport and the authorities. Many states do not mandate such reporting and, therefore, the bill fills that need; (2) a rule against retaliation for those who report suspected abuse; (3) a limitation on coaches and other adults from taking a child to a place that is not observable by others; and (4) for the first time, makes amateur sports organizations accountable for abuse of children. Taken together, these are large steps forward.

The epidemic of child abuse in the United States needs Congress to lead the way on child protection with this bill. Children deserve the protections of the Protecting Young Victims Act and they need it now. Thank you for your efforts for the protection of America's children.

Sincerely,

MARCI A. HAMILTON,
CEO.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a letter from the United States Olympic Committee, dated January 24, 2018.

UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE,

Colorado Springs, CO, January 24, 2018.

TO TEAM USA: The athlete testimony that just concluded in the Nassar hearings framed the tragedy through the eyes of the victims and survivors, and was worse than our own worst fears. It was powerful because of the strength of the victims, survivors and parents, who so eloquently and forcefully told their stories and so rightfully demanded justice. The USOC should have been there to hear it in person, and I am deeply sorry that did not happen.

The purpose of this message is to tell all of Nassar's victims and survivors, directly, how incredibly sorry we are. We have said it in other contexts, but we have not been direct enough with you. We are sorry for the pain caused by this terrible man, and sorry that you weren't afforded a safe opportunity to pursue your sports dreams. The Olympic family is among those that have failed you.

I know this apology is not enough. We have been working on taking steps at the USOC and mandating changes among National Governing Bodies to ensure this does not happen again. Our next steps will be these:

1. We Must Change the Culture of the Sport. This was the primary recommendation of the independent Deborah Daniels Report on USA Gymnastics and the athlete testimony underlined its importance. We heard athletes describe being unsure or unaware of how to report abuse and to whom, and sometimes even what constitutes abuse. We heard athletes describe being afraid or discouraged from reporting abuse. We heard athletes describe feeling hurt, betrayed, discounted and alone. Since October of last year, we have been engaged in direct talks with USAG leadership on this fundamental point. New leadership at the board level is critical and you recently saw three USAG board resignations. Further changes are necessary to help create a culture that fosters safe sport practice, offers athletes strong resources in education and reporting, and ensures the healing of the victims and survivors. This includes a full turnover of leadership from the past, which means that all current USAG directors must resign.

2. We Must Change the Governance Structure of the NGB. We need to help USA Gymnastics better support its mission, which is to provide the best resources and safest environment for athletes to train and compete. We have strongly considered decertifying USAG as a National Governing Body. But USA Gymnastics includes clubs and athletes who had no hand in this and who need to be supported. We believe it would hurt more than help the athletes and their sport. But we will pursue decertification if USA Gymnastics does not fully embrace the necessary changes in their governance structure along with other mandated changes under review right now.

3. We Must Know Who Knew What and When. The USOC has decided to launch an investigation by an independent third party to examine how an abuse of this proportion could have gone undetected for so long. We need to know when complaints were brought forward and to who. This investigation will include both USAG and the USOC, and we believe USAG will cooperate fully. We will make the results public.

4. We Must Support Safe Sport Victims and Survivors. Team USA safe sport assault victims and survivors need access to testing, treatment and counseling. The USOC will devote substantial funds to help provide these resources to victims and survivors. We are working on the details of how this funding will become available to athletes and will communicate them soon.

I hope that all members of Team USA remember that the USOC ombudsman office is always available to provide free, independent and confidential help to athletes with concerns or questions about safe sport or other matters. Contact information, along with other helpful athlete resources, are here.

In order to bring even more focus and urgency to these important points, the USOC board of directors has mobilized a board-level working group chaired by independent board member Susanne Lyons.

Finally, I invite any member of Team USA to communicate with me or Ms. Lyons directly if there is more that you think the Olympic family can or should be doing for you and your families.

Sincerely,

SCOTT BLACKMUN,
Chief Executive Officer.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. POE for his long-standing work on these issues, the two

House cosponsors, and the Senator, and I want to end with, with that volcanic action, there was no reaction, a deafening silence. Let us, with the passage of this bill, begin the journey of commitment, along with our acknowledgment of the Me Too movement that we will never be silent again.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 534, the “Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act”.

This bill will help prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities.

This is a reasonable and important measure that is intended to protect young athletes from abuse and preserve the sanctity of sports associated with the U.S. Olympic Committee—the organization responsible for preparing and training young athletes who might one day represent our Nation competitively all over the world.

Children deserve to fully enjoy the innocence of their youth—by exploring the curiosities of the world, taking pleasure in the arts, and participating in sports—free from abuse.

Sexual abuse of children and youth is an abhorrent practice that is intolerable in any context, and we must take appropriate measures to eliminate it from youth sports.

Young people look to adults to protect them and keep them safe. We all have a responsibility to do so. With S. 534, we have an opportunity to ensure that individuals abide by this duty.

Certain other professionals—such as doctors, dentists, social workers, psychologists, teachers, and daycare workers, are already bound by law to report suspected abuse to law enforcement. S. 534 will require the same of adults who interact with young athletes in connection with sports activities organized by the national governing bodies of various sports.

The urgent need for this legislation is best illustrated by the horrible abuse and exploitation of numerous young gymnasts at the hands of Dr. Larry Nassar, who victimized young athletes participating in USA Gymnastics over the course of 20 years. The stories of abuse and suffering of these young women are heartbreaking.

Many complaints of sexual and emotional abuse by Nassar and others went unreported for years—allowing coaches, instructors, and doctors to repeatedly victimize gymnasts as young as six years old.

The shocking failure of anyone to report accusations to law enforcement, or even keep track of complaints internally, made it possible for some of these predators to commit multiple, horrific acts over time.

We entrust the care of our children and young athletes in the hands of those we hope to uphold that trust and not abuse it.

One of the more than 150 girls and women victimized by Dr. Nassar was recently quoted as saying, “He has everything he needs to be an incredible leader. He has the personality . . . the skill . . . the knowledge. And he's using that to prey on people . . . what a waste.”

Last week, a Michigan judge sentenced Nassar to a prison sentence of up to 175 years. The judge described Nassar's assault of scores of girls and women, under the pretense that he was treating them, as “precise,

calculated, manipulative, devious and despicable.”

We must continue to do more to help protect our young athletes, and this bill will greatly assist in that effort. However, I must note a concern with a change the bill before us would make to the Senate-passed version of S. 534. The bill unanimously passed by the Senate would authorize funding to be provided to the U.S. Center for Safe Sport in the amount of \$1 million for each of the next five years.

Unfortunately, the version of the bill before us strips this funding authorization. I believe we should have taken up the Senate bill, without amendment. Safe Sport is charged with important responsibilities under this bill—with respect to receiving and investigating allegations of abuse and setting policies to prevent future abuse. It is critical that we ensure that the Center is provided the resources for those things to be done immediately and effectively.

By doing so, I hope we will prevent the type of abuse and suffering perpetrated by people like Larry Nassar.

In a recent open letter from the U.S. Olympians and Paralympians Association to athletes everywhere, they wrote: “The goal of Olympism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity. Now we must ask how can athlete dignity be preserved when the responsible institutions fail so in their oversight?”

In an apology letter to Team USA from the United States Olympic Committee issued last week, the Committee admitted that it had failed its young athletes.

While the USA Gymnastics scandal is unfortunate, let it be an example and incentive to prevent such abuse from happening again.

Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

The “Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act” is a necessary measure to ensure young athletes in this country are able to pursue their athletic dreams in safe environments, free of the fear of being victimized by predators.

I thank the many organizations that have worked hard to advance this legislation, including Rape Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN), the Nation’s largest anti-sexual violence organization.

I’d like to enter into the record a letter from RAINN, which indicates survivors are reaching out to its National Sexual Assault Hotline in record numbers, at a 21 percent increase.

Each day approximately 600 individuals affected by sexual violence are served, most of whom are children or parents seeking support.

For the foregoing reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask support of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas, not only for her support of the legislation, but also for her long-time working on these issues of victims of crime, and her involvement in legislation in the past and in the future on matters such as this.

This is not a happy event, Mr. Speaker. This legislation, as Mr. Bishop said,

it is unfortunate that Congress had to get involved in this issue. Congress is going to get involved, and we are going to try to rectify the problems of the past and hold people accountable for crimes in the future.

We are talking about the symbol of everything that is good, and right, and beautiful about America: these Olympics, the Olympians, and particularly the gymnasts who represent America; the training they go through; the zeal for which they represent our country and work. Yet, while all of that was going on, bad things were happening to them.

Our gymnasts who just participated in the last Olympics, who won medals, gold medals, they endured abuse, yet they went forward to represent our country in the United States Olympics.

People who harm those girls and other athletes, male and female, they need to be held accountable, not just Larry Nassar, but other people need to be held accountable. This is where law enforcement needs to be involved.

Mr. Speaker, I am a former judge, and I want to commend the judge in this case, Judge Rosemarie Aquilina, for allowing all of these victims to testify in open court. They had the courage to come forward and tell very difficult things, things that are difficult for us to even listen to here on the House floor. They said it, and they wanted the criminal to know what he had done to them impacted them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the judge for allowing that, but also the sentence that she imposed. I want to read a few more of the statements, Mr. Speaker:

Jessica Rodriguez: “USA Gymnastics should be held accountable for each and every one of these acts of abuse they allowed to happen.”

Taryn Look: “I was still a child. . . . I wanted to end my life.”

Mattie Larson: “I was at the height of my career at 19, and the Olympics were just a year away, and I just couldn’t take any more of the abuse. I was broken. Larry, my coaches, and USA Gymnastics turned a sport I fell in love with as a kid to my personal living hell.”

Mr. Speaker, all of these brave Americans came forward and testified about what had happened to them. And we should—they are all Olympians for that. They all deserve the gold medal for what they did representing our country and their strength and their courage to testify in open court about what happened to them.

The defendant, the convicted criminal, wrote a letter to the judge, Mr. Speaker, saying he couldn’t take all of this abuse against him for having to listen to all of the statements by the victims. Are you kidding me? He is not the victim. He is the criminal, and he belongs in jail.

He belongs in jail, as these victims have said, for the rest of his life, to keep him away from little girls. And I am glad that that is where he is going,

but he is not a victim. Because of the mental abuse that he caused on victims of crime, he needs to remember what he has done. And I am glad that we have finally got this legislation passed in such a quick method. It is proof, Mr. Speaker, that we can work pretty fast, we also can work in a bipartisan manner, and we can also work with the Senate getting legislation that is important to America passed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read one last statement, and I include in the RECORD the 133 written statements that I have, subject to length limitation in the RECORD.

STATEMENTS BY 133 PEOPLE

Kyle Stephens: “Little girls don’t stay little forever, they grow into strong women that return to destroy your world.”

Jessica Thomashow: “What you did to me was twisted. You manipulated me and my family. How dare you.”

Donna Markham (Speaking on behalf of her daughter, Chelsey, who killed herself 10 years ago.): “In 2009, she took her own life. She couldn’t deal with the pain anymore. Every day I miss her, every day. It all started with him.”

Jade Capua: “I am no longer broken by you. Every day I grow a new strength and look into the mirror to see a strong, unbreakable person. Nothing will ever take away what you’ve done to me or to the others that started behind me. However, we can walk free and radiate the strength that we’ve gained from your horrific acts, something you will never be able to do.”

Alexis Moore: “I don’t like the word victim. I am a survivor, but more so I am me. Those 10 years are a part of my story. They have helped define who I am today.”

Olivia Cowan: On Michigan State University and USA Gymnastics:

“If they would have taken action when it was first reported, they would have saved me.”

Nicole Soos: “I thought he was a famous doctor. There was no way he would do anything inappropriately in front of my mom. I was wrong.”

Ashley Erickson: “Today I can say I’m finally ready to face you . . . Why did you do this? You were the adult, you were the doctor.”

Rebecca Mark: “He molested me and he molested me with my mom in the room.”

Bethany Bauman: “I am 100% confident, that if he had not been caught, he would have continued to do this for the rest of his life.”

Kate Mahon: “By publicly speaking out against Larry Nassar, I’m not just speaking out for myself. I’m speaking out for all the girls and women of the past, present, and future that have been or will be affected by sexual assault.”

Danielle Moore: “I hope being reduced to a (prison) number will define you as it defined me for so many years. I will no longer be known as a number, and I will be Dr. Danielle Moore.”

Melissa Imrie: “Everybody’s story that I listened to today is just an echo of everything that I’ve went through. They’re just speaking like it’s my voice.”

Megan Halicek: “As I stand here, I still flash back to the feelings of fear, laying frozen in his office, my sweating shaking body, adrenaline pumping, painfully clutching the sides of the table, waiting for the sick treatment to be over.”

Jamie Dantzschler: “There is no therapy, no cure for monsters like you. You are pure evil.”

Brianne Randall: "I was a 17-year-old that reported your abuse to police in 2004. You used my vulnerability at the time to sexually abuse me. I reported you to police immediately and had a rape kit done . . . you had the audacity to tell [police] I misunderstood the treatment because I wasn't comfortable with my body. How dare you? Sadly they took your word instead of mine."

Anna Ludes (video statement): "I felt so special and lucky that Larry Nassar would take the time to help me. But it turned out that he was a molester."

Lindsey Schuett (video statement): "If anyone deserves to never see the light of day again it is this man."

Marion Siebert: "You hindered the trajectories of our lives that we and our parents worked so very hard for, and changed the rest of our lives in ways that we're still realizing and dealing with every day. This is what makes this crime so heinous."

Katelyn Skrabis (statement read on her behalf): "Nothing can change what Larry Nassar did to me."

Taylor Stevens (statement read on her behalf): "Because of you my life has been forever changed. I have to live with the fact that I am a victim of sexual assault."

Breanne Rata (statement read on her behalf): "My only relief is knowing my picture is no longer on the wall of your Michigan State office."

Erin McCann: "I was told over and over again how honored I should feel for seeing Dr. Nassar . . . It was no honor. It was disgust. It took more than it should have from me."

Jennifer Rood-Bedford: "The road to healing looks steep from where I am standing now, but I am a warrior."

Gina Nichols (on behalf of her daughter, Olympic hopeful Maggie Nichols): "You are not a real doctor. You are a serial child molester, a pedophile."

Tiffany Lopez Thomas: "I imagine hitting you if I ever had the opportunity to see you again. Instead I will allow my thoughts and my feelings to hit your heart."

Jeanette Antolin: "You made me believe you were my friend. I truly believe you are the spawn of Satan. There's no therapy that will fix the evil that's deep inside you."

Kayla Spicher: "I was sexually assaulted, but I was unaware, not because I was naive, but because I was a child."

Gwen Anderson: "I still remember him saying, 'It's OK. I know you're not used to being touched there, but it will feel better.'"

Thomas Brennan (Gwen's coach): "For the record, go to hell . . . What you did to everyone else who trusted you and sent girls your way is disgusting, reprehensible, unforgivable."

Amanda Thomashow: "Larry, the thing you didn't realize when you were sexually assaulting me . . . was that you were building an army of survivors who would ultimately expose you for who you are. From this rubble we will rise as an army of female warriors."

Jaime Doski: "I want to show my family how strong I am and that I'm a survivor."

Jenelle Moul: "I hope you are never able to walk outside those [prison] walls as a free man. Most importantly I hope all of the survivors you hurt are able to heal from the damage you have done."

Madeline Jones: "Before every appointment, I cried in the bathroom. After every appointment, I couldn't wait to get home and shower."

Amanda Barterian: "I refuse to let Larry Nassar take anything more from here. He's already taken enough."

Jennifer Hayes: "You parted my legs and forcefully pushed your dry fingers in my vagina . . . You had created a secure world where you brainwashed everyone around you."

Nicole Walker: "I have anxiety and sleep disorders all because of what you did to me."

Chelsea Williams: "He manipulated me with such ease, with such finesse. This is perhaps what scares me the most about him."

Stephanie Robinson: "While I came to this stand as a victim, I leave as victor."

Carrie Hogan: "I am broken, I'm tired, I feel like life has been desperately sucked out of me."

Helena Weick: "This is not my shame anymore. It's yours."

Amanda Cormier: "These things happened to me in his office long ago were not short lived and uncomfortable moments. They were lifelong traumas that changed the way I walk in the world."

McKayla Maroney (statement read on her behalf): "He abused my trust. He abused my body and he left scars on my psyche that will never go away. It all started when I was 13 or 14 years old. It didn't end until I left the sport."

Annette Hill: "As your former patient, I trusted you, Larry. You sexually abused me."

Aly Raisman: "I will not rest until every last trace of your influence on this sport has been destroyed like the cancer it is."

Lyndsy Carr Gamet: "I was a carefree silly little girl until this happened and afterwards there was a cloud and the cloud has followed me into every relationship in my life, especially the most important ones."

Taylor Cole: "This man has broken my world."

Jessica Smith: "I'm mortified that I didn't understand exactly what that meant at that time."

Arianna Guerrero: "I am only 16. I should not even know what an impact statement is. I shouldn't know what the inside of a courtroom looks like. You have a hard time looking at me now. But you didn't seem to have a problem when I was half naked on your table."

Nicole Reeb: "[Michigan State University's] response has compounded my pain. I am frustrated and outraged at the administration's inability to take responsibility for handing over children and girls to a predator for almost 20 years. I no longer bleed green."

Christine Harrison: "You knew what you were doing was wrong and you only asked for forgiveness because you got caught."

Jessica Tarrant (recorded video): "I wasn't even alive yet the first time he sexually assaulted someone and I was only one when he was first reported."

Brian Tarrant (Jessica's father): "I just want to say, Larry, you did nothing to defeat her."

Mary Fisher-Follmer (on behalf of her two daughters, Katherine Payne and Maureen Payne): "As you deteriorate in prison, I want you to remember you lost."

Katie Rasmussen: "No one did anything because no one believed me. They didn't understand how such a respectable doctor would do something like that. And I don't understand how a 14-year-old could make that up."

Madeline Johnson: "I realized the only way I could get him to stop was if I lied and told him pain was all gone."

Chelsea Zerfas: "I avoided going to practice when I knew I had to see him . . . I felt like I couldn't breathe and I'd tremble in fear."

Samantha Ursch: "I'm not pretending it didn't happen anymore. I'm just moving past it."

Kara Johnson: "The framed photos of patients on his wall told an incredible story of a doctor who could heal anyone."

Clasina Syrov: "When girls came forward and told an adult the adults didn't listen."

Why didn't they listen? What good is it to teach children to tell an adult if the grown-up doesn't listen, doesn't take action?"

Brad Johnson (Kara and Madeline's father): "Your story is dark, sinister, and pure evil."

William Michell (Larissa's father): "You sowed a destructive black seed in my daughter's innocent mind and body."

Amy Labadie: "Come hell or high water we'll take every last one of you down that could have stopped this monster."

Ashley Yost: "That's something a 25-year-old shouldn't have to do . . . sleep in their parents' bed because they're afraid of a monster."

Marie Anderson: "While his fingers were inside of me, he would apply pressure to the outside of my lower abdomen and massage the inside of my vaginal area."

Kassie Powell: "You hid for years behind Olympic rings and a Spartan [Michigan State University's mascot] head, but now there is nowhere left for you to hide."

Doug Powell (Kassie's father): "I want you to fear and cry, and no one to listen. I want you to remain alive for your eternal life in those [prison] walls."

Megan Ginter: "I am done being ashamed of something that was out of my control."

Katherine Gordon: "Sexual assault is distant until you realize each girl in the news is a broken mirror."

Katelynne Hall: "What if someone would have taken the abuse seriously?"

Anya Gillengarten: "I thought the things that Larry Nassar did to me would send me to Hell."

Amanda McGeachie: "MSU has failed to represent us; failed to respect us; failed to take accountability for our safety. After being a proud Spartum alum . . . I now feel ashamed to have represented a school who will not take accountability."

Lindsay Woolever: "You were in the best position to help people but you chose to do the opposite."

Hannah Morrow: "Life's handed me lemons, and you'd best believe that I am well prepared to make lemonade."

Jordyn Wieber: "Even though I am a victim, I won't live my life as one. I am an Olympian."

Alexis Alvarado: "I was only a child when this abuse started. I didn't know what he was doing was wrong."

Morgan McCaul: "You violated the very principle of your calling: Do no harm."

Trinea Gonczar: "It's time for me to stand up for these little girls and not stand behind you anymore. Goodbye, Larry. May god bless your dark broken soul."

Larissa Michell Boyce: "Today is a new day. Today I am claiming my freedom from you. Today I am breaking free from the chains you put me in 20 years ago. Today I am finally free. I am standing here reclaiming the voice that you stole from me. I am reclaiming my confidence. I am reclaiming the power you took from me. I am reclaiming Larissa Michell, that innocent girl you abused. I am no longer that little girl. I am taking her back, I have the control now."

Bayle Pickel: "How could you do something so horrible to an innocent young girl?"

Adam Boyce (Larissa's husband): "It was and still is very real for us."

Bailey Lorenzen: "While my mind heals and filters out the evil sickness that you unwillingly bestowed upon my body your mind will get darker and darker and you will hate yourself almost as much as everyone hates you in this room right now."

Valerie Webb: "To all my sisters, we need to stand, fight back and not rest until this mess is up mopped up; each and every crumb."

Whitney Mergens: "All I want is for this darkness to go away. I don't want to look in

the mirror and have to convince myself that I'm okay. I want to stand there and see a strong woman other than a damaged one. Standing here today I know the light is near."

Marta Stern: "I will no longer carry the weight of what you did to me so long ago. The burden is yours."

Melody Posthuma-Vanderveen: "We need to call out the deeper issue at hand. We live in a society where action is not taken when it's most needed."

Emma Ann Miller: "[Michigan State University] is still sending bills to my mom for appointments where I was sexually assaulted."

Amanda Smith: "I will not stop speaking until I am heard, until we are heard, until things are changed."

Taylor Livingston: "Everyone who continued to allow this man, knowing full well what he was doing, is to blame."

Lindsey Lemke: "Larry, I hope you . . . and all others realize you've pissed off the wrong army of women."

Christy Lemke-Akeo (mother of gymnast Lindsey Lemke): "These girls had no idea this wasn't a medical procedure."

Krista Wakeman: "You're a sick man, Larry. I hope you rot in prison because that's where you belong."

Paula Daniels (on behalf of daughter Samantha Daniels): "When you lay down to sleep at night I want you to see every little girl's face that you've abused. Hundreds of girls Larry, innocent girls who trusted you—and know these little girls are all grown-up now and I pray that they haunt you every single day."

Alliree Gingerich (statement read on her behalf): "Not one day goes by where I don't replay the abuse my head."

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, here is what Natalie Woodland said: "I am strong, and I am beautiful, and I am bold, and no one, especially you"—Nassar—"can take that away from me. . . . While standing up here, I'm finally realizing that I'm not alone."

And she is not alone. We are on her side. We should be on the side of victims of crime, and this legislation will promote a better atmosphere: a lawful, good atmosphere for our gymnasts and other athletes to work in. The people who committed these crimes need to be held accountable, and society has started with the first culprit, Larry "Lecherous" Nassar, and there should be more to follow.

And that is just the way it is, Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following statements from the Nassar trial:

Megan Farnsworth (statement read on her behalf): "He took away something I can't get back. He took it 18 years ago when he did his procedures, and again when I was adult and learned what he had been doing."

Kourtney Weidner (statement read on her behalf): "Through these years I've experienced increase in anxiety and stress."

Charla Burill (statement read on her behalf): "You were the doctor who would give me a hug, who seemed to understand."

Lauren Michalak (statement read on her behalf): "It makes me feel disgusted that a man that was so respected in the community could take advantage of a girl who was only in 8th grade."

Sherry Bradley (mother of Vanasia Bradley): "I am sick to my stomach with disgust and betrayal."

Presley Allison: "I was abused while my own mother was in the room."

Kamerin Moore: "You molested a little girl who had just lost her father . . . you used my father's death as another opportunity to manipulate the trust I put in you."

Catherine Hannum: "What he did to me . . . is disgusting, vile, and wrong. I am going to find my sense of self again and it starts with this letter."

Jessica Chedler Rodriguez: "USA Gymnastics should be held accountable for each and every one of these acts of abuse they allowed to happen."

Taryn Look: "I was still a child . . . I wanted to end my life."

Mattie Larson: "I was at the height of my career at 19 and the Olympics were just a year away and I just couldn't take any more of the abuse. I was broken. Larry, my coaches, and USA Gymnastics turned the sport I fell in love with as a kid to my personal living hell."

Whitney Burns: "As this man's hands were touching places I had never let any man touch, I told myself I could make it one more second without the anger exploding inside me. 'One more second, Whitney, you can make it one more second.'"

Isabell Hutchins (statement read on her behalf): "I couldn't accept the fact that it happened to me and I was in denial for a long time."

Natalie Woodland: "I am strong, and I am beautiful, and I am bold, and no one, especially not you can take that away from me . . . While standing up here I'm finally realizing that I'm not alone."

Jilliam Swinehart: "You have to be the most sick and twisted person ever to do that to young girls."

Anne Swinehart (Jillian's mother): "To think, I let this happen to my child while I was sitting right there."

Alison Chauvette: "He was in no way treating my body. He was, however using his position, manipulating me as a person changing the person I was, preying on me, a young girl, to fulfil his sick fantasies."

Anna Dayton: "You were supposed to be the good guy. Instead you used your power and your authority to take advantage of me, to take away my trust, and strip me of my innocence."

Olivia Venuto (statement read on her behalf): "I know that we will overcome this."

Sarah (no last name provided): "By coming forward, we victims of Larry Nassar can help see that justice is served."

Kristen Thelen: "In that moment of terror and confusion, I completely froze."

Alexandra Romano (statement read by her sister Danielle Romano): "The pain is just beginning for you. You disgust me and everyone else in this world and like many other girls said, today is the last day you are anything to me. You are a sad excuse for a human being and from now on you're dead to us."

Jessica Howard (statement read on her behalf): "My mother blames herself."

Arianna Castillo: "He told me I had to go through pain in order to be successful in the sport."

Selena Brennan: "Today is your time to face me. I want you to continue to look at me while I speak because that is the attention I deserve . . . I want you to know you have not defeated me."

Kaylee McDowell: "My body is scarred by you . . . You covered me with your illness

and I will be contaminated by you for the rest of my life."

Emily Morales: "He would rub one hand up and down my leg and butt as the other ungloved hand penetrated me . . . He talked about how my muscles were so tight."

Abigail Mealy: "The final level of your horrible pyramid of lies is when I had to lie on a table in your basement next to your lit fireplace and your children's toys surrounding me while you 'treated' me for my back problems."

Ashley Bremer: "He was only acting as my friend to gain my trust."

Brooke Hylek: "All I ever wanted to do was feel better and go back to the sport I loved without any pain."

Abigail Bergeron: "I was a victim of Larry Nassar but I will not let that define me."

Emily Meinke: "My initial gut reaction was to question the technique . . . I couldn't help but wonder how inserting his bare fingers in my vagina was supposed to make my pain disappear. Since I hadn't even had my period yet I assumed it was my vagina but I really didn't know for sure."

Morgan Valley (statement read by her mother, Dawn Valley): "This so-called doctor took advantage of my pain and my innocence."

Marty Valley (father of Morgan Valley): "We're overcome by anger and guilt for not protecting our beautiful, precious daughter. As difficult as it is for us as parents, we know it's nothing compared to what these young women are going through."

Christina Barba: "We know that a single candle can light a dark room. Imagine what all these flames can do. We will not live in darkness. We will burn brightly. To all the abusers and predators and harassers and enablers, we will burn your pedestals and hiding places to the ground. All your darkest secrets will be brought to light. We are strong and will not let you snuff out our light. We will burn brightly and not with hate but with hope."

Makayla Thrush: "Nobody should ever have to question their doctor, especially one who was the doctor for the US Olympic team."

Sterling Riethman: "Larry did not violate Jane Doe. He did not sexually assault Jane Doe . . . he violated real girls and real women. Well, those little girls are here today and we said it before and we'll say it again, time's up. The truth will come out."

Kaylee Lorincz: "You made a critical mistake. You underestimated the mind, power, and will of your victims, these accomplished athletes."

Rachael Denhollander (Her testimony to the IndyStar began the legal case): "I can call what you did evil and wicked because it was . . . I can call it evil because I know what goodness is. And this is why I pity you."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) that the House suspend the rules and pass S. 534, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1745

ESTABLISHING REQUIREMENTS FOR USE OF DRIVER'S LICENSE OR PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD FOR OPENING AN ACCOUNT OR OBTAINING A FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1457) to establish requirements for use of a driver's license or personal identification card by certain financial institutions for opening an account or obtaining a financial product or service, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1457

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

SECTION 1. MAKING ONLINE BANKING INITIATION LEGAL AND EASY.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AFFILIATE.**—The term “affiliate” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841).

(2) **DRIVER'S LICENSE.**—The term “driver's license” means a license issued by a State to an individual that authorizes the individual to operate a motor vehicle on public streets, roads, or highways.

(3) **FEDERAL BANK SECRECY LAWS.**—The term “Federal bank secrecy laws” means—

(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

(B) section 123 of Public Law 91–508 (84 Stat. 1116); and

(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code.

(4) **FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “federally recognized Indian Tribe” has the meaning given the term by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104(a) of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 5131(a)).

(5) **FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “financial institution” means—

(A) an insured depository institution;

(B) an insured credit union; or

(C) any affiliate of an insured depository institution or insured credit union.

(6) **FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE.**—The term “financial product or service” has the meaning given the term in section 1002(15) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481(15)).

(7) **INSURED CREDIT UNION.**—The term “insured credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(8) **INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.**—The term “insured depository institution” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(9) **ONLINE SERVICE.**—The term “online service” means any Internet-based service, such as a Web site or mobile application.

(10) **PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.**—The term “personal identification card” means an identification document issued by a State, local government, or federally recognized Indian Tribe to an individual solely for the purpose of identification of that individual.

(11) **PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—The term “personal information” means the information displayed on or electronically encoded on a driver's license or personal identification card that is reasonably necessary to fulfill the purpose and uses permitted by subsection (b).

(12) **STATE.**—The term “State” means any State, commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, the

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, or the United States Virgin Islands.

(13) **SCAN.**—The term “scan” means the act of using a device or software to decipher, in an electronically readable format, personal information displayed on or electronically encoded on a driver's license or personal identification card.

(b) **USE OF A DRIVER'S LICENSE OR PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—When an individual initiates a request through an online service to open an account with a financial institution or obtain a financial product or service from a financial institution, the financial institution may record personal information from a scan of the driver's license or personal identification card of the individual, or make a copy or receive an image of the driver's license or personal identification card of the individual, and store or retain such information in any electronic format for the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(2) **USES OF INFORMATION.**—Except as required to comply with Federal bank secrecy laws, a financial institution may only use the information obtained under paragraph (1)—

(A) to verify the authenticity of the driver's license or personal identification card;

(B) to verify the identity of the individual; and

(C) to comply with a legal requirement to record, retain, or transmit the personal information in connection with opening an account or obtaining a financial product or service.

(3) **DELETION OF IMAGE.**—A financial institution that makes a copy or receives an image of a driver's license or personal identification card of an individual in accordance with paragraph (1) shall, after using the image for the purposes described in paragraph (2), permanently delete, within a reasonable amount of time—

(A) any image of the driver's license or personal identification card, as applicable; and

(B) any copy of any such image.

(c) **DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to amend, modify, or otherwise affect any State or Federal laws that govern a financial institution's disclosure and security of personal information that is not publicly available.

(d) **RELATION TO STATE LAW.**—The provisions of this section shall preempt and supersede any State law that conflicts with a provision of this section, but only to the extent of such conflict.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as financial service products continue to merge with the ever-evolving world of technology, the opportunities to reach unbanked and underserved households also continue to increase. According to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 7 percent of the U.S. population is

unbanked, and 19.9 percent is underbanked.

The FDIC has concluded previously that mobile banking is well positioned to meet the day-to-day financial service needs of underbanked consumers as well as consumers at risk of account closure. Providing mobile financial services products to these households has shown to improve their financial outcomes by giving consumers more control over their finances, which helps households avoid burdensome fees and allows them to manage necessary payments more conveniently.

Further FDIC research suggests that nearly three-quarters of all underbanked households have access to a smartphone and that more than one-third of underbanked households used mobile banking in the past year. In particular, the FDIC found that mobile financial services improved account stability by helping underserved consumers successfully manage and maintain bank accounts.

Unfortunately, access to mobile financial service products is not equal across the United States. The Making Online Banking Initiation Legal and Easy Act remedies this lack of parity by establishing a uniform policy nationwide, allowing a financial institution to record personal information from a driver's license for the purpose of opening a bank account with a scan or copy.

The MOBILE Act creates uniform access to helpful financial products and provides certainty to financial institutions to offer their full range of mobile banking products to all consumers nationwide.

While the MOBILE Act creates a consistent law across the United States, it is careful to protect consumer privacy information and existing State privacy laws. The bill requires financial institutions to delete all copies of a driver's license and personal identification after having used them for the permitted purposes of opening an account.

The legislation is also careful not to reduce any financial institution's commitment to comply with Federal and State laws aimed at preventing identity theft, financial fraud, money laundering, or know your customer and Customer Identification Programs.

A Federal Reserve report from 2016 found that mobile banking use was rising at relatively fast rates, reporting that 43 percent of all mobile phone owners with a bank account had used mobile banking in the past 12 months, up from 39 percent in 2014 and 33 percent in 2013.

Following this trend, the use of mobile banking will continue to grow, and the MOBILE Act ensures that every consumer across the country who wants to use a mobile banking product is able to do so. This bill was passed out of the Financial Services Committee on a unanimous, bipartisan vote.

The MOBILE Act provides consumers easier access to the highly regulated financial services industry by simplifying their ability to open an account through the process of scanning or copying their State-issued identification card. As one State banking association wrote to me:

This legislation is mutually beneficial to both financial institutions and their customers. The MOBILE Act will help expand access to critical banking services for underbanked populations by offering similar retail services through mobile technology.

Increasing access for mobile financial services products also means giving rural communities, like many of the small towns I represent in Colorado, access to financial success. While many of us can drive a short distance, walk into a bank, and open an account, there are rural communities where physical bank locations are few and far between. By allowing those with smartphones to essentially have their bank accounts in their pocket, geography is no longer a constraint to accessing financial services products.

All families should have the tools they need to be able to achieve the financial stability and the prosperity the MOBILE Act will provide.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is important for the future financial health of our Nation's customers. I urge its passage here today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1457, the Making Online Banking Initiation Legal and Easy, or MOBILE, Act, permits financial institutions to copy or scan a consumer's driver's license or personal ID card when a consumer decides to obtain a financial product or service.

At a time when more Americans are conducting their business online and through their phones, the MOBILE Act will help expand access to banking products and financial services for those consumers who do not have access to a traditional brick-and-mortar financial institution by allowing consumers to utilize their smartphones to open a checking or savings account.

While financial inclusion has increased significantly over the past 20 years, still, too many Americans do not get their basic financial needs met by traditional financial service providers. For example, in June 2016, the Obama administration released a report indicating that about 7 percent of American households still lack access to a bank account, and another 20 percent supplement their bank account with nontraditional financial services like check cashing or payday loans.

Technological innovations in the financial industry and commonsense proposals like the MOBILE Act here in Congress will continue to help us close this gap. The bill will expand credit opportunities for consumers who cannot easily get to a bank in person and provides them access to innovative new

products that can improve their overall financial health.

An amendment in the nature of a substitute was adopted in committee that makes the MOBILE Act even stronger, and I want to thank Mr. TIPTON for putting these improvements forward.

These improvements require financial institutions to permanently delete copies of consumers' ID cards within a reasonable amount of time after they have opened the account, made clarifying changes to better harmonize the bill's requirements with Federal bank secrecy laws, and recognized identification cards issued by federally recognized Indian Tribes as an acceptable identification card.

Perhaps most importantly, the bill also prohibits financial institutions from selling or otherwise sharing the personally identifiable information they collect from consumers with unaffiliated third parties.

The bill is supported by several financial technology and industry groups, including the Innovative Lending Platform Association and the Financial Services Roundtable.

Again, in a day and age when more and more Americans are conducting their business online and through their smartphones but still continue to lack access to traditional banking services and financial products, we need to be doing all we can to simplify the process and encourage account openings through these platforms.

The MOBILE Act is a strong step in that direction, and I have been proud to join the bill as a cosponsor. I encourage Members to vote "yes."

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1457, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATION CHARTER FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1426) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act to allow Federal savings associations to elect to operate as national banks, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1426

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 "Federal Savings Association Charter Flexibility Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. OPTION FOR FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS TO OPERATE AS A COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATION.

The Home Owners' Loan Act is amended by inserting after section 5 (12 U.S.C. 1464) the following:

"SEC. 5A. ELECTION TO OPERATE AS A COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATION.

"(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'covered savings association' means a Federal savings association that makes an election approved under subsection (b).

"(b) ELECTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon issuance of the rules described in subsection (f), a Federal savings association may elect to operate as a covered savings association by submitting a notice to the Comptroller of such election.

"(2) APPROVAL.—A Federal savings association shall be deemed to be approved to operate as a covered savings association on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Comptroller receives the notice under paragraph (1), unless the Comptroller notifies the Federal savings association otherwise.

"(c) RIGHTS AND DUTIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as otherwise provided in this section, a covered savings association shall—

"(1) have the same rights and privileges as a national bank that has its main office situated in the same location as the home office of the covered savings association; and

"(2) be subject to the same duties, restrictions, penalties, liabilities, conditions, and limitations that would apply to such a national bank.

"(d) TREATMENT OF COVERED SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS.—A covered savings association shall be treated as a Federal savings association for the purposes—

"(1) of governance of the covered savings association, including incorporation, bylaws, boards of directors, shareholders, and distribution of dividends;

"(2) of consolidation, merger, dissolution, conversion (including conversion to a stock bank or to another charter), conservatorship, and receivership; and

"(3) determined by regulation of the Comptroller.

"(e) EXISTING BRANCHES.—A covered savings association may continue to operate any branch or agency the covered savings association operated on the date on which an election under subsection (b) is approved.

"(f) RULEMAKING.—The Comptroller shall issue rules to carry out this section—

"(1) that establish streamlined standards and procedures that clearly identify required documentation or timelines for an election under subsection (b);

"(2) that require a Federal savings association that makes an election under subsection (b) to identify specific assets and subsidiaries—

"(A) that do not conform to the requirements for assets and subsidiaries of a national bank; and

"(B) that are held by the Federal savings association on the date on which the Federal savings association submits a notice of such election;

"(3) that establish—

"(A) a transition process for bringing such assets and subsidiaries into conformance with the requirements for a national bank; and

“(B) procedures for allowing the Federal savings association to provide a justification for grandfathering such assets and subsidiaries after electing to operate as a covered savings association;

“(4) that establish standards and procedures to allow a covered savings association to terminate an election under subsection (b) after an appropriate period of time or to make a subsequent election;

“(5) that clarify requirements for the treatment of covered savings associations, including the provisions of law that apply to covered savings associations; and

“(6) as the Comptroller deems necessary and in the interests of safety and soundness.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, mutual savings banks, cooperative banks, and mutual savings and loan associations are essential community-based financial institutions that have a long history of serving their neighbors and promoting small-town economic growth.

However, many of the benefits once given to Federal savings associations, also known as thrifts, that encouraged community growth and financial well-being have been stifled by changes initiated under the Dodd-Frank Act. While Dodd-Frank eliminated many of the benefits provided to Federal savings associations, the HOLA restrictions, unfortunately, remain.

These restrictions have left Federal savings associations at a disadvantage and without the flexibility needed to adapt to meet community needs and, as a result, are forcing many mutual banks to either close or merge with other institutions, meaning fewer and more expensive choices for consumers hoping to finance important purchases.

H.R. 1426, Mr. ROTHFUS' bipartisan legislation that passed out of the Financial Services Committee unanimously, would help to preserve these important community financial institutions by providing mutual banks with a framework to become covered savings associations. This process would provide thrifts the ability to operate with the same rights and duties as national banks without subjecting them to a complex, time-consuming, and costly charter conversion process.

Providing thrifts the flexibility to exercise national bank powers without changing their charters would give in-

stitutions the ability to exceed the commercial and consumer loan limits that apply under the Home Owners' Loan Act but continue to benefit from their structure for purposes of consolidation, merger, dissolution, conservatorship, and receivership.

Because the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency already supervises both national bank and Federal savings association charters, it is uniquely positioned to provide the structural framework for the election process that would transition the rights and duties of a national bank to a thrift.

Mr. ROTHFUS' bill instructs the OCC to develop a series of rulemakings to outline this election process, while also requiring safeguards to prevent malpractice in the transition process, as well as abuses in the new structure once it has been instituted.

□ 1800

Community financial institutions should be given the tools they need to lend effectively to their communities, and this bill creates the legislative landscape for savings associations to do just that.

Ultimately, the bill creates opportunities for families and small businesses to access financing for their important purchases, from buying a home to expanding a business.

Federal savings associations have a long, proud history of being responsive to their communities' needs, and this legislation will help them to enhance and continue that record.

I cannot give more emphatic support for this commonsense, bipartisan legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, currently, the Home Owners' Loan Act imposes limitations on the portfolio mix of loans and investments that a thrift institution can make. Such limitations include the amount of commercial and consumer loans that a thrift can hold and a requirement that they hold a certain percentage of qualified thrift investments. These restrictions are not currently faced by national banks and other financial institutions.

If a thrift decides that it wants to engage in more commercial lending or otherwise seeks to expand its product offerings beyond what is allowed under current law, they have to undergo a time-consuming process of converting the stock form of their organization in order to apply for a national bank charter. For smaller thrifts in particular, the charter conversion process can be costly.

H.R. 1426 solves this problem by amending the Home Owners' Loan Act and creating an election process for thrifts to operate as a national bank without having to convert their charter to a national bank.

This proposal originated from former Comptroller Curry in 2014 to give thrifts flexibility with respect to the current limitations on the amount of commercial and consumer loans that a thrift can hold.

While the terms and conditions of a charter are important, we should be careful about blurring lines. Therefore, I am pleased that the OCC can reject providing the flexibility to a particular thrift under this bill and can take other supervisory actions to promote safety and soundness.

According to the FDIC, there were 768 thrifts as of last September, compared to nearly 5,000 State and national banks, and all but 15 of these thrifts have less than \$10 billion in assets, which underscores that this bill will mostly help small institutions better serve their communities.

Former Comptroller Curry described the proposal as a tool for enabling “Federal thrifts to diversify their loan portfolios, maintain their Federal charter, and retain the OCC as their regulator.”

I thank Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. HIMES for introducing this bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit. He is also the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support of this important bipartisan legislation, and especially the lead Democratic cosponsor, Representative JIM HIMES from Connecticut.

The Federal Savings Association Charter Flexibility Act is a commonsense reform bill that will help to ensure that community banks, many of which have histories stretching back generations, can continue to serve the needs of Main Street businesses and families.

Specifically, this bill focuses on Federal savings associations, also known as thrifts. These institutions are similar to national banks in the sense that they are both chartered and regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the FDIC.

But these banks are constrained in their ability to pursue certain lines of business under the Home Owners' Loan Act, also known as HOLA. Specifically, HOLA subjects Federal thrifts to commercial lending limits.

Under what is known as the qualified thrift lender test, at least 65 percent of a Federal thrift's portfolio assets must comprise certain mortgage and consumer-related assets. These institutions are also constrained in their ability to hold commercial loans, paper, or corporate debt. In contrast, national banks enjoy the ability to engage in a much wider range of lending activities.

These restrictions originally made sense because thrifts also enjoyed advantages not afforded to national banks. But changes in law have eliminated or curtailed many of those benefits, and some thrifts have expressed frustration that these restrictions prevent them from being able to meet the changing needs of their local communities. Unfortunately, thrifts have not been immune to the industrywide trend of consolidations and closures that has accelerated over the last decade.

The Federal Savings Association Charter Flexibility Act provides these banks with additional flexibility to adjust to changing times and continue to serve their communities, despite these persistent headwinds.

Under current law, the only option available to Federal savings associations is a costly and complicated conversion to a national bank charter. This is a particularly burdensome process for mutually chartered Federal thrifts since it requires that they first convert to stock form before converting their charter.

The Federal Savings Association Charter Flexibility Act provides another, less disruptive option. Under my bill, Federal thrifts will have the ability to pursue a path that will allow them to operate with the same rights and duties as a national bank. But these banks will not have to go through the costly and cumbersome process of converting to stock form and then rechartering. Instead, the bill sets up a simple 60-day election process that will allow these institutions to become covered savings associations.

It will also require the OCC, which has been supportive of this legislation and has responsibility for regulating Federal savings associations and national banks, to establish an orderly and streamlined transition process.

This bill also includes important safeguards to prevent potential fire sales of assets and subsidiaries during the transition process, and it protects the OCC's ability to prevent firms from abusing the new structure.

Altogether, this effort will help to ensure that time-tested community financial institutions will continue to be able to serve their customers for years to come.

The Federal Savings Association Charter Flexibility Act has the support of the American Bankers Association and the Independent Community Bankers of America. It is also bipartisan, and it passed the Financial Services Committee with a 55-0 vote. Similar language has been included in the bipartisan Senate Banking Committee package, also.

In short, this bill represents the sort of reasonable, commonsense, across-the-aisle reform that our constituents want to see.

I want to briefly share some comments from the Pennsylvania Bankers Association, which represents a wide range of banks in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In their letter of sup-

port for this bill, they wrote: “. . . this legislation represents sound, sensible regulatory relief.”

They also added that “Federal savings associations are known for being responsive to their communities’ needs, and this legislation will help them to expand and continue to do so.”

I ask that my colleagues support H.R. 1426, the Federal Savings Association Charter Flexibility Act.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1426.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIFYING ACCEPTANCE OF DONATED MORTGAGE APPRAISALS BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2255), to clarify that nonprofit organizations may accept donated mortgage appraisals, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2255

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

TITLE I—HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES MADE EASIER

SEC. 101. EXEMPTION FROM TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.

Section 129E(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639e(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO APPRAISAL DONATIONS.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), if a fee appraiser voluntarily donates appraisal services to an organization described in section 170(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, such voluntary donation shall be deemed customary and reasonable.”.

TITLE II—EXPANDING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR RURAL JOB CREATORS

SEC. 201. ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR RURAL-AREA SMALL BUSINESSES.

Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (j)(4)(C), by striking “and women-owned small businesses” and inserting “, women-owned, and rural-area small businesses”; and

(2) in subsection (j)(6)(B)(iii), by striking “and women-owned small businesses” and inserting “, women-owned, and rural-area small businesses”.

TITLE III—SENIOR SAFE

SEC. 301. IMMUNITY.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this title—

(1) the term “Bank Secrecy Act officer” means an individual responsible for ensuring compliance with the requirements mandated by subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the “Bank Secrecy Act”);

(2) the term “broker-dealer” means a broker and a dealer, as those terms are defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a));

(3) the term “covered agency” means—

(A) a state financial regulatory agency, including a State securities or law enforcement authority and a State insurance regulator;

(B) each of the entities represented in the membership of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council established under section 1004 of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3303);

(C) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(D) a securities association registered under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-3);

(E) a law enforcement agency; and

(F) a State or local agency responsible for administering adult protective service laws;

(4) the term “covered financial institution” means—

(A) a credit union;

(B) a depository institution;

(C) an investment adviser;

(D) a broker-dealer;

(E) an insurance company;

(F) an insurance agency; and

(G) a transfer agent;

(5) the term “credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301);

(6) the term “depository institution” has the meaning given the term in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c));

(7) the term “exploitation” means the fraudulent or otherwise illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of an individual, including a caregiver or a fiduciary, that—

(A) uses the resources of a senior citizen for monetary or personal benefit, profit, or gain; or

(B) results in depriving a senior citizen of rightful access to or use of benefits, resources, belongings, or assets;

(8) the term “insurance agency” means any business entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates insurance coverage;

(9) the term “insurance company” has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a));

(10) the term “insurance producer” means an individual who is required under State law to be licensed in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance coverage;

(11) the term “investment adviser” has the meaning given the term in section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a));

(12) the term “investment adviser representative” means an individual who—

(A) is employed by or associated with an investment adviser; and

(B) does not perform solely clerical or ministerial acts;

(13) the term “registered representative” means an individual who represents a broker-dealer in effecting or attempting to effect a purchase or sale of securities;

(14) the term “senior citizen” means an individual who is not younger than 65 years of age;

(15) the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States;

(16) the term “State insurance regulator” has the meaning given the term in section 315 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6735);

(17) the term “State securities or law enforcement authority” has the meaning given the term in section 24(f)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78x(f)(4)); and

(18) the term “transfer agent” has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

(b) IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.—

(1) IMMUNITY FOR INDIVIDUALS.—An individual who has received the training described in section 302 shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for disclosing the suspected exploitation of a senior citizen to a covered agency if the individual, at the time of the disclosure—

(A) served as a supervisor or compliance officer (including as a Bank Secrecy Act officer) for, or, in the case of a registered representative, investment adviser representative, or insurance producer, was affiliated or associated with, a covered financial institution; and

(B) made the disclosure—

(i) in good faith; and

(ii) with reasonable care.

(2) IMMUNITY FOR COVERED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—A covered financial institution shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for a disclosure made by an individual described in paragraph (1) if—

(A) the individual was employed by, or, in the case of a registered representative, insurance producer, or investment adviser representative, affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution at the time of the disclosure; and

(B) before the time of the disclosure, each individual described in section 302(a) received the training described in section 302.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) or (2) shall be construed to limit the liability of an individual or a covered financial institution in a civil action for any act, omission, or fraud that is not a disclosure described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 302. TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A covered financial institution or a third party selected by a covered financial institution may provide the training described in subsection (b)(1) to each officer or employee of, or registered representative, insurance producer, or investment adviser representative affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution who—

(1) is described in section 301(b)(1)(A);

(2) may come into contact with a senior citizen as a regular part of the professional duties of the individual; or

(3) may review or approve the financial documents, records, or transactions of a senior citizen in connection with providing financial services to a senior citizen.

(b) CONTENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The content of the training that a covered financial institution or a third party selected by the covered financial institution may provide under subsection (a) shall—

(A) be maintained by the covered financial institution and made available to a covered agency with examination authority over the covered financial institution, upon request, except that a covered financial institution shall not be required to maintain or make available such content with respect to any individual who is no longer employed by or affiliated or associated with the covered financial institution;

(B) instruct any individual attending the training on how to identify and report the suspected exploitation of a senior citizen internally and, as appropriate, to government officials or law enforcement authorities, including common signs that indicate the financial exploitation of a senior citizen;

(C) discuss the need to protect the privacy and respect the integrity of each individual customer of the covered financial institution; and

(D) be appropriate to the job responsibilities of the individual attending the training.

(2) TIMING.—The training under subsection (a) shall be provided—

(A) as soon as reasonably practicable; and

(B) with respect to an individual who begins employment with or becomes affiliated or associated with a covered financial institution after the date of enactment of this Act, not later than 1 year after the individual becomes employed by or affiliated or associated with the covered financial institution in a position described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a).

(3) RECORDS.—A covered financial institution shall—

(A) maintain a record of each individual who—

(i) is employed by or affiliated or associated with the covered financial institution in a position described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a); and

(ii) has completed the training under subsection (a), regardless of whether the training was—

(I) provided by the covered financial institution or a third party selected by the covered financial institution;

(II) completed before the individual was employed by or affiliated or associated with the covered financial institution; and

(III) completed before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) upon request, provide a record described in subparagraph (A) to a covered agency with examination authority over the covered financial institution.

SEC. 303. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to preempt or limit any provision of State law, except only to the extent that section 301 provides a greater level of protection against liability to an individual described in section 301(b)(1) or to a covered financial institution described in section 301(b)(2) than is provided under State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak on behalf of these important bills today.

While low-income applicants and homebuilders seek to provide affordable, decent housing opportunities to qualifying individuals and families, these nonprofits rely on the generosity of others in their communities to accomplish their mission. These groups also heavily rely on meticulous budgets, and a change in the input costs can have serious implications for a

project's success as well as the number of families a group can serve.

The Dodd-Frank Act increased requirements for real estate appraisers and transferred rulemaking authority for residential mortgage appraisals to the CFPB. Under Dodd-Frank, professionals who furnish appraisal services for a fee are able to receive a payment that is “customary and reasonable” for the market area where the appraisal services were performed. However, the CFPB has not defined the terms “customary” and “reasonable,” which has left nonprofit housing organizations with the serious concern that they violate the law when the work of appraisers is donated.

If nonprofit housing organizations are required to start paying for appraisal services, which could cost over \$1,000 per appraisal, the Dodd-Frank statute could unintentionally limit the number of families in need that these nonprofit organizations can serve.

Mr. TROTT's legislation, the Housing Opportunities Made Easier Act, would remedy this uncertainty by amending the Truth in Lending Act to allow mortgage appraisal services to be donated by fee appraisers to an organization that is eligible to receive tax-deductible charitable contributions.

This simple fix will ensure that housing nonprofit organizations can continue to provide their incredibly important services for as many in-need families in our communities as possible, and I commend Mr. TROTT for this legislation.

I would also like to voice my support for H.R. 4281, the Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act.

As a former small-business owner in a rural part of Colorado, I know firsthand how important access to capital is for the success of a small business. The majority of capital for small businesses is concentrated in urban areas, and access to capital for rural small businesses can be difficult to come by.

H.R. 4281 would require the SEC's Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation to identify any unique challenges that rural-area small businesses have in securing access to capital and require the Small Business Advocate to provide updates on its findings in its annual report.

Small businesses are the lifeblood of communities across our country, providing jobs and services to those they serve, and this legislation will help hardworking small businesses in rural communities to continue to create jobs and grow their businesses.

I would also like to give my support to Representative SINEMA's and Representative POLIQUIN's bill, the Senior Safe Act, here today. H.R. 3758 takes important steps to safeguard our senior citizens from fraud and abuse by encouraging covered financial institutions to train supervisors, compliance officers, or legal advisers on how to spot and report predatory activity against senior citizens.

This legislation also protects banks, credit unions, investment advisers and

broker-dealers and their employees from civil or administrative liability when reporting fraudulent activity related to senior citizens if an employee is properly trained and reports such activity “in good faith” and “with reasonable care.”

This group of bills will make important and impactful changes for our communities, and I am pleased to see them considered here on the floor today.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2255, a package of three commonsense solutions, each passed unanimously by the House Financial Services Committee. I thank Congressman TROTT of Michigan for his leadership in moving this package forward.

One of these solutions is H.R. 3758, the Senior Safe Act, legislation we introduced to protect seniors from financial fraud and abuse.

Mr. Speaker, one in five American seniors will be a target of financial abuse, and seniors lose an estimated \$2.9 billion to exploitation. The financial institutions that serve America's seniors are in a unique position to detect and identify the suspicious patterns of activity that often accompany financial abuse.

Unfortunately, these institutions do not have the legal flexibility to report suspicious behavior to law enforcement. Because of this, financial abuse of our seniors may go unreported and unpunished. That is why we introduced the Senior Safe Act.

Our bill helps individuals and financial institutions safely communicate instances of financial fraud involving seniors to the appropriate law enforcement authority. It creates incentives for firms to train their employees to identify and stop financial fraud of seniors. It shields advisers and firms that responsibly disclose instances of fraud from legal liability. Importantly, it accomplishes all of this while providing reasonable legal safeguards to ensure consumers and their data are protected.

Mr. Speaker, it may seem like years, but it was just 4 months ago that the then-CEO of Equifax came before Congress to testify about the data breach that exposed the personal information of over 145 million Americans.

□ 1815

Those who mishandle our private data and breach the public trust must be held accountable. We must also ensure that we do all we can to minimize the damage caused by cyber attacks and financial fraud.

As a result of the Equifax data breach, millions of American seniors are now more vulnerable to financial abuse. It is all but certain that we will see increased attempts of financial fraud and identity theft. The Senior

Safe Act is an important and responsible step to protecting those at risk by ensuring that financial institutions can identify fraud, report it, and stop abuse of the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING, Ranking Member WATERS, and Congressman POLIQUIN from Maine for working with me on this bipartisan solution to protect seniors from financial fraud and abuse. We are proud to work across the aisle to get things done, and we will continue working to protect seniors and get results for Arizona.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), a member of the Financial Services Committee and the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2255, the Housing Opportunities Made Easier, or the HOME Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), for being the lead Democrat on this bill. I appreciate his bipartisan leadership and his efforts to bring this bill to the floor for a vote.

I also thank my colleague in the Senate, Senator PORTMAN, for his leadership on this issue. It has been a pleasure working with him to ensure Habitat for Humanity and other nonprofits are able to continue their important mission.

Finally, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his support in the Financial Services Committee.

During my first term in Congress, I, along with my entire district office, had the opportunity to join Habitat for Humanity on one of their builds in Oakland County, Michigan. It was great fun helping them build a Michigan family's home, but I think we often forget that Habitat for Humanity and other nonprofit housing organizations do so much more than just build a home.

These nonprofits actually offer families who live in their homes, no- or low-interest homes, making the dream of homeownership affordable for so many. The home, of course, needs to be appraised before a loan may be approved. Many times, professional appraisers volunteer their services so that the nonprofit does not have to incur additional expense.

Early last year, I met with Habitat for Humanity leaders from Michigan and I heard about their struggle to ensure that homes remain affordable under the regulations promulgated by Dodd-Frank. Under the new law, all fee appraisers must be paid a customary and reasonable fee for their work.

So where does this leave Habitat for Humanity and other nonprofits?

This means they may no longer accept donated appraisals, forcing them to divert money from their core homebuilding activities.

In fact, Habitat for Humanity told me that these complex rules have tri-

pled the cost of originating loans. This is particularly a problem in rural areas where, under Dodd-Frank, appraisers are also required to be compensated for mileage expenses. Some chapters have informed us they may need to stop or limit their work altogether, denying a valuable service to many communities.

My bill, the HOME Act, which passed out of committee with a unanimous bipartisan vote of 55-0, would exempt Habitat for Humanity and other nonprofits from this burdensome rule, allowing them to accept donated appraisals, which, in turn, will lower the cost for homes for Michigan families.

We in Congress should stand by their side, not in their way. This bill gets Washington out of the way by providing that a donated appraisal may be considered “customary and reasonable” when benefiting charities. All other consumer protections in the Truth in Lending Act remain in place. It is a simple, targeted fix that does nothing to harm the underlying law or Dodd-Frank.

When I came to Congress, I knew that I would be fighting for small businesses who are often ignored or hurt by Washington, but I never thought we would need to defend charitable organizations. I am glad that Congress is using some common sense to solve this obvious unintended consequence.

There is no need for debate or dissent on this bill. We cannot let Dodd-Frank undermine these fine organizations from their mission of providing homes to our neighbors in need.

Again, I thank all of the members of the Financial Services Committee for their unanimous bipartisan support. I urge all of my colleagues to support the work of worthy housing charities by voting “yes” on H.R. 2255.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN).

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their leadership in including this important and bipartisan piece of legislation in the package the House is considering today.

Nevadans and all Americans deserve the opportunity to have a good job that will help them provide for their families. Unfortunately, rural communities across the country have been hit particularly hard by shifts in population as people move to bigger cities in search of employment opportunities.

The changing demographics have made it harder for small businesses in these areas to get started and to survive. Far too many Nevadans, especially in our rural areas, have been left out and left behind from the economic growth we have seen in other areas of the country.

I am proud to sponsor the Expanding Access to Capital for Rural Job Creators Act, which will help expand economic opportunities for entrepreneurs

and small businesses in Nevada's rural areas. This bill will help identify and examine the unique challenges that these businesses face when trying to secure access to capital.

By supporting job creators in our rural communities, we can create a path to good-paying jobs for all Nevadans and help make sure that they have the tools to work towards a better life for themselves and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this piece of legislation.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. TIPTON for managing the floor today on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. HENSARLING, for moving this very important bill, H.R. 2255, through the committee and on to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and thank Mr. TROTT, a terrific representative from the State of Michigan, for all of his work on this bill to help families and charitable organizations throughout our country.

Mr. Speaker, the great State of Maine that I represent, the rural part of our State, has the oldest average age in the country. We love our seniors. I know not only in Maine, but across the country, they are very special parts of our society. My parents are 89 and 87. I am very involved in their lives, especially in their healthcare.

I worry, Mr. Speaker, about our seniors. I worry about their healthcare. I worry about their safety. And one more thing I worry about, Mr. Speaker, is about them becoming victims of financial scams.

Now, this happens throughout our country, and has increasingly so, such that, today, almost \$3 billion is the result of scamming our seniors every single year. I will tell you, these con men, Mr. Speaker, become very creative.

In particular, one type of scam that I have learned about just absolutely hits me home. A grandmother receives an email from, supposedly, a granddaughter, and this granddaughter is stuck overseas in a country where she has been traveling. She is emailing her grandmother, saying: "Gram, I need money. I am in trouble. Can you please wire \$10,000 to this bank account in this country so I can get home? And, by the way, please don't tell mom and dad."

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the confusion and the heartache that grandparents would have receiving this sort of email?

Well, the good news, Mr. Speaker, is that the Senior Safe Act, which I authored here in the House, along with Ms. SINEMA, is embedded in Mr. TROTT's bill, H.R. 2255. This bill, the Senior Safe Act—now part of Mr. TROTT's bill—will help stop financial scams of seniors before they happen.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. It is a commonsense bill, Mr. Speaker, such that if a bank teller speaks to one of his or her customers they have known for maybe decades, and the senior says, "I would like to close my account and wire the proceeds overseas," this bank teller can stop, pause, call the authorities, and say, "We might have a problem here, Mr. SMITH, so let's get back to you on that," and the teller can do this without retribution from our privacy laws.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everybody, Republicans and Democrats, men and women, to please support H.R. 2255, which the Senior Safe Act is embedded in.

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

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2255, the HOME Act introduced by Mr. TROTT and Mr. HIMES amends the Truth in Lending Act to allow fee appraisers to voluntarily donate their appraisals to non-profit groups without violating the requirement that lenders and their agents compensate fee appraisers at a rate that is customary and reasonable.

Historically, appraisal services relating to no- or low-interest mortgage loans that were provided by non-profit organizations or to families often had to be donated by professional appraisers in the community and considered permissible charitable donations for tax purposes.

However, such non-profit organizations like Habitat for Humanity, have raised concerns this provision reduced the number of families it could serve because the voluntary donation of appraisal services could now be interpreted as a violation of the TILA's "customary and reasonable" fee requirement.

While the CFPB—under the direction of former-Director Richard Cordray—has already provided non-profit organizations like Habitat with informal guidance suggesting that the "customary and reasonable" provision does not apply to donated appraisals because the appraiser is no longer a "fee appraiser" in this circumstance, these organizations have continued to raise concerns and are seeking further clarity.

Specifically, non-profit organizations continue to raise concerns that they remain vulnerable to enforcement actions because this guidance appears to be inconsistent with the common industry usage of the term "fee appraiser"; they also contend that it remains unclear whether or not other agencies would align with the CFPB's interpretation.

Thus, this bill provides the non-profits with the certainty they are seeking, and builds upon the great work already done by former Director Cordray by clarifying appraisers can voluntarily donate their appraisal services without violating TILA's "customary and reasonable" fee provision.

The HOME Act passed our Committee earlier this month with broad bipartisan support, and I was proud to support it.

Also included in H.R. 2255, are two other pieces of legislation that passed our Committee with strong bipartisan support.

First, the Senior Safe Act, introduced by Ms. SINEMA, which provides employees at financial institutions with immunity when voluntarily disclosing the possible financial abuse of elders to state and federal regulators, law enforcement, and adult protective services agencies.

And second is H.R. 4281, introduced by Mr. KIHUEN which would enhance capital opportunities for our nation's rural small businesses by requiring the SEC's Office of the Small Businesses Advocate to develop policies and recommend steps Congress can take to drive private investment to our nation's rural small businesses.

As Ranking Member of the House Small Business Committee, I have a strong understanding of the capital challenges our nation's rural small businesses face and I am proud to cosponsor Mr. KIHUEN's legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the inclusion of both Ms. SINEMA's and Mr. KIHUEN's legislation only enhances what was already a strong bipartisan measure.

Therefore, I recommend a "Yes" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2255, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTION LIVING WILL IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4292) to reform the living will process under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4292

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 "Financial Institution Living Will Improvement Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. LIVING WILL REFORMS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 165(d) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5365(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "periodically" and inserting "every 2 years"; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking "The Board" and inserting the following:

"(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The Board";

(B) by striking "shall review" and inserting the following: "shall—

"(i) review";

(C) by striking the period and inserting "and"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date the company submits the resolution plan, provide feedback to the company on such plan.

"(B) *DISCLOSURE OF ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK.*—The Board of Governors and the Corporation shall publicly disclose the assessment framework that is used to review information under this paragraph."

(b) TREATMENT OF OTHER RESOLUTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to an appropriate Federal banking agency that requires a banking organization to submit to the agency a resolution plan not described under section 165(d) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act—

(A) the respective agency shall ensure that the review of such resolution plan is consistent with the requirements contained in the amendments made by this Act;

(B) the agency may not require the submission of such a resolution plan more often than every 2 years; and

(C) paragraphs (6) and (7) of such section 165(d) shall apply to such a resolution plan.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection:

(A) **APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.**—The term “appropriate Federal banking agency” —

(i) has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

(ii) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(B) **BANKING ORGANIZATION.**—The term “banking organization” means—

(i) an insured depository institution;

(ii) an insured credit union;

(iii) a depository institution holding company;

(iv) a company that is treated as a bank holding company for purposes of section 8 of the International Banking Act; and

(v) a U.S. intermediate holding company established by a foreign banking organization pursuant to section 252.153 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations.

(C) **INSURED CREDIT UNION.**—The term “insured credit union” has the meaning given that term under section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act.

(D) **OTHER BANKING TERMS.**—The terms “depository institution holding company” and “insured depository institution” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed as limiting the authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency (as defined under subsection (b)(2)) to obtain information from an institution in connection with such agency’s authority to examine or require reports from the institution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the living wills process, as mandated under the Dodd-Frank Act for systemically important financial institutions and designated nonbank financial companies, has become a heavily burdensome process for the institutions subjected to it.

Section 165 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires bank holding companies with total consolidated assets of \$50 billion or more to annually submit detailed plans to the Federal Reserve and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation that describe the company’s strategy for rapid and orderly resolution under the Bankruptcy Code in the event of its material financial distress or failure.

The Federal Reserve and the FDIC have near total discretion in deciding whether a plan is acceptable, and, therefore, whether an institution will be subject to heavy penalties.

Mr. ZELDIN’s legislation, the Financial Institution Living Will Improvement Act, will do just that: improve the regulatory process for both sides of the living will assessment. This bipartisan legislation will provide needed change by limiting the frequency of the living wills process to a 2-year cycle, requiring regulators to publicly disclose the framework used to be able to review resolution plans, and requiring feedback on resolution plans within 6 months of the date they were submitted.

Mr. Speaker, the regulators themselves—members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the FDIC—have suggested before Congress that reforms should be made to the living wills process. Recognition from those running the process that the living wills framework needs to be reformed demonstrates the necessity of Mr. ZELDIN’s bill.

Mr. ZELDIN’s legislation, which was voted out of the Financial Services Committee unanimously, takes steps toward effectiveness and efficiency in this process, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure here today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is straightforward, commonsense legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ZELDIN for working with Democrats to make improvements to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my Democratic colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Financial Services Committee and the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan legislation, which I was proud to introduce with my colleague from New York, Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY.

This legislation would provide needed reforms to the living will submission process, would ensure that impacted financial institutions get needed feedback from their regulators, and would uphold sensible standards to protect the financial system.

This may sound like wonky financial policy, but to the hardworking men

and women in my district, fixing these confusing regulations that have choked off community lending can be the determining factor with regards to getting a small business loan or a mortgage.

These are the financial products that provide access to the American Dream, that help communities grow through homeownership, and that allow small-business owners to hire and expand.

Now, more than ever, we need to be working on a bipartisan basis to improve the standards and reform the confusing regulations that are being imposed on our community banks and financial institutions.

This bill changes the procedure for the submission and review of resolution plans, also known as living wills.

□ 1830

This legislation is in line with recommendations from a 2016 GAO report in which it was recommended that banking regulators should publicly disclose the assessment frameworks, consider shifting to a 2-year cycle, and provide feedback to companies within a minimum of 6 months.

The vast discretion granted to Federal regulators under the current law’s living will regime is essentially a license for those regulators to decide the proper size, scale, and business model of private sector enterprises.

This legislation reins in that unchecked government authority and provides greater accountability and much-needed transparency to the living will process.

This bill requires public disclosure of the rules for living wills and also requires regulators to follow up with financial institutions in a timely fashion with the feedback necessary to meet these standards.

These reforms are critical for providing our Nation’s banking systems and the customers they serve, to protect our Nation’s banking systems.

This bill cleared the Financial Services Committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 60-0. I am especially thankful for the bipartisan cooperation of my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the ranking member of the Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank Chairmen Hensarling and Luetkemeyer for their leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD these letters of support from the Financial Services Roundtable and the American Bankers Association.

FINANCIAL SERVICES ROUNDTABLE,

Washington, DC, January 29, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI:
The Financial Services Roundtable (FSR) supports H.R. 4292 the “Financial Institution

Living Wills Improvement Act of 2017," sponsored by Representative Lee Zeldin.

H.R. 4292 changes the procedure for the submission and review of resolution plans, also known as "living wills." The bill would adjust the frequency of resolution plan submissions from annually to a two-year cycle, require regulators to provide feedback within six months of submission and publicly disclose the framework used to review the plans. Improving the resolution plan process provides transparency, accountability and efficiency while enabling firms to enhance their plans.

The Federal Reserve Board and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation require resolution plan submissions be reviewed and updated annually. It is increasingly evident, however, that these annual requirements are neither efficient nor effective for both regulators and covered firms. Resolution plans do not change substantially from year to year, absent a material change in a firm's structure. A Government Accountability Office (GAO) report on resolution planning supports a longer submission cycle so firms have sufficient time to revise their plans and incorporate regulatory feedback.

Similarly, GAO recommended that regulators make the assessment frameworks public, noting transparency would promote accountability by the agencies and result in better resolution plans. Providing firms clarity as to how determinations are made will eliminate the uncertainty around the appropriate changes necessary to strengthen the resolution plan. Further, requiring regulators to provide feedback within a defined period will enable firms to address deficiencies and ensure the institution's strength in the event of financial distress or failure.

H.R. 4292 helps improve how U.S. financial regulations work for individuals, financial institutions, and the U.S. economy. FSR supports H.R. 4292 the "Financial Institution Living Wills Improvement Act of 2017," and urges enactment of important legislation.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY CIMINO,
Senior Vice President
& Head of Government Affairs.

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the members of the American Bankers Association, I am writing to express our support for H.R. 4292, the Financial Institution Living Will Improvement Act of 2017. This legislation is scheduled for consideration on the January 29th suspension calendar.

This bipartisan legislation introduced by Representatives Lee Zeldin and Carolyn Maloney, Ranking Member of the Capital Markets, Securities and Investment Subcommittee, would improve the process for banks subject to the "living will submissions" process. Requiring filings no more frequently than every two years and timely regulator feedback on the submissions would make the resolution planning process more efficient, while still supporting regulators' ability to deal with a failed institution.

H.R. 4292 passed the House Financial Services Committee on November 15, 2017 by a unanimous vote of 60-0.

This is a commonsense piece of legislation that provides needed reforms. We urge the

House of Representatives to approve H.R. 4292.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. BALLENTINE,
Executive Vice President,
Congressional
Relations and Political
Affairs.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4292, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 695, CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-537) on the resolution (H. Res. 714) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 695) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 534, by the yeas and nays; and
H.R. 1457, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE AND SAFE SPORT AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 534) to prevent the sexual abuse

of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 3, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—406

Abraham	Cramer	Harris
Adams	Crawford	Hartzler
Aderholt	Crist	Hastings
Aguilar	Crowley	Heck
Allen	Cuellar	Hensarling
Amodei	Culberson	Herrera Beutler
Arrington	Curtis	Hice, Jody B.
Babin	Davidson	Higgins (LA)
Bacon	Davis (CA)	Higgins (NY)
Banks (IN)	Davis, Danny	Hill
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Himes
Barr	DeFazio	Holding
Barragan	DeGette	Hollingsworth
Beatty	Delaney	Hoyer
Bera	DeLauro	Hudson
Bergman	DelBene	Huffman
Beyer	Demings	Huizenga
Biggs	Denham	Hultgren
Bilirakis	Dent	Hunter
Bishop (GA)	DeSantis	Hurd
Bishop (MI)	DeSaulnier	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Deutch	Jackson Lee
Black	Diaz-Balart	Jayapal
Blackburn	Dingell	Jeffries
Blum	Doggett	Jenkins (WV)
Blunt Rochester	Donovan	Johnson (GA)
Bonamici	Doyle, Michael	Johnson (LA)
Bost	F.	Johnson (OH)
Boyle, Brendan	Duffy	Johnson, Sam
F.	Duncan (SC)	Jones
Brady (PA)	Duncan (TN)	Jordan
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Joyce (OH)
Brat	Ellison	Kaptur
Bridenstine	Emmer	Katko
Brooks (AL)	Engel	Keating
Brooks (IN)	Eshoo	Kelly (MS)
Brown (MD)	Espallat	Kelly (PA)
Brownley (CA)	Esty (CT)	Khanna
Buchanan	Evans	Kihuen
Buck	Farenthold	Kildee
Bucshon	Faso	Kilmer
Budd	Ferguson	Kind
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)
Bustos	Fleischmann	King (NY)
Butterfield	Flores	Kinzinger
Byrne	Fortenberry	Knight
Calvert	Foster	Krishnamoorthi
Capuano	Fox	Kuster (NH)
Carbajal	Frankel (FL)	Kustoff (TN)
Carson (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Carter (GA)	Fudge	LaHood
Carter (TX)	Gabbard	LaMalfa
Cartwright	Gaetz	Lamborn
Castor (FL)	Gallagher	Lance
Castro (TX)	Garamendi	Langevin
Chabot	Garrett	Larsen (WA)
Cheney	Gianforte	Larson (CT)
Chu, Judy	Gibbs	Latta
Cicilline	Gohmert	Lawrence
Clark (MA)	Gomez	Lawson (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lee
Clay	Goodlatte	Levin
Cleaver	Gosar	Lewis (GA)
Clyburn	Gotthelmer	Lewis (MN)
Coffman	Gowdy	Lieu, Ted
Cohen	Granger	Lipinski
Cole	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Loebsack
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Lofgren
Comer	Green, Al	Long
Comstock	Green, Gene	Loudermilk
Conaway	Griffith	Love
Connolly	Grijalva	Lowenthal
Cook	Grothman	Lowe
Cooper	Guthrie	Lucas
Correa	Hanabusa	Luetkemeyer
Costa	Handel	Lujan Grisham,
Costello (PA)	Harper	M.

Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger

Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—3

Amash Massie Sanford

NOT VOTING—21

Barton DesJarlais Kennedy
Bass Estes (KS) McClintock
Blumenauer Gallego McNeerney
Cárdenas Gutiérrez Pocan
Courtney Jenkins (KS) Renacci
Cummings Johnson, E. B. Russell
Curbelo (FL) Kelly (IL) Turner

□ 1857

Mr. SANFORD changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 45.

ESTABLISHING REQUIREMENTS FOR USE OF DRIVER'S LICENSE OR PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD FOR OPENING AN ACCOUNT OR OBTAINING A FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1457) to establish requirements for use of a driver's license or personal identification card by certain financial institutions for opening an account or obtaining a financial product or service, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Tipton) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 8, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—397

Abraham Cole
Adams Collins (GA)
Aderholt Collins (NY)
Aguiar Comer
Allen Comstock
Amodei Conaway
Arrington Connolly
Babin Cook
Bacon Cooper
Banks (IN) Correa
Barletta Gohmert
Barr Costello (PA)
Barragán Cramer
Beatty Crawford
Bera Crist
Bergman Crowley
Beyer Cuellar
Biggs Culberson
Billirakis Curtis
Bishop (GA) Davidson
Bishop (MI) Davis (CA)
Bishop (UT) Davis, Danny
Blum Davis, Rodney
Blunt Rochester DeFazio
Bonamici DeGette
Bost Delaney
Boyle, Brendan DeLauro
F. DelBene
Brady (PA) Demings
Brady (TX) Denham
Brat Dent
Bridenstine DeSantis
Brooks (AL) DeSaulnier
Brooks (IN) Deutch
Brown (MD) Diaz-Balart
Buchanan Dingell
Buck Doggett
Bucshon Donovan
Budd Doyle, Michael
Bustos F.
Butterfield Duffy
Byrne Duncan (SC)
Calvert Duncan (TN)
Capuano Dunn
Carbajal Ellison
Carson (IN) Emmer
Carter (GA) Engel
Carter (TX) Eshoo
Cartwright Espallat
Castor (FL) Estes (KS)
Chabot Esty (CT)
Cheney Evans
Chu, Judy Farenthold
Cicilline Faso
Clark (MA) Ferguson
Clarke (NY) Fitzpatrick
Clay Fleischmann
Cleaver Flores
Clyburn Fortenberry
Coffman Foster
Cohen Foxx

Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating

Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David

Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—8

Amash Griffith
Black Grothman
Burgess Labrador

NOT VOTING—25

Barton Curbelo (FL) Kennedy
Bass DesJarlais McClintock
Blackburn Gallego McNeerney
Blumenauer Gutiérrez Pocan
Brownley (CA) Heck
Cárdenas Issa
Castro (TX) Jenkins (KS)
Courtney Johnson, E. B.
Cummings Kelly (IL) Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1906

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

SMALL BUSINESS ACCESS TO CAPITAL AFTER A NATURAL DISASTER ACT

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4792) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for small businesses affected by hurricanes or other natural disasters, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4792

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 “Small Business Access to Capital After a Natural Disaster Act”.

SEC. 2. EXPANDING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR SMALL BUSINESSES IMPACTED BY A NATURAL DISASTER.

Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (j)(4)(C), by striking “minority-owned and women-owned small businesses” and inserting “minority-owned small businesses, women-owned small businesses, and small businesses affected by hurricanes or other natural disasters”; and

(2) in subsection (j)(6)(B)(iii), by striking “minority-owned and women-owned small businesses” and inserting “minority-owned small businesses, women-owned small businesses, and small businesses affected by hurricanes or other natural disasters”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, small businesses across the country are especially vulnerable to natural disasters. Recent natural disasters like Hurricane Harvey in Texas and the wildfires in California have left small businesses torn apart in their wake.

Nationally, there has been a survey of 500 small businesses. In 2015, they found that 75 percent of small businesses do not develop plans to be able to prepare for disasters. This means that small businesses are nationally unprepared for natural disasters and are likely to experience a fair amount of difficulty in reopening their doors, a concerning economic challenge in the aftermath of an already challenging time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ's bill, the Small Business Access to Capital After a Natural Disaster Act, would help alleviate some of these challenges by requiring the Securities and Exchange Commission's Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation to identify any unique challenges in securing access to capital for small businesses that have been affected by hurricanes or natural disasters.

As a former small-business owner and co-chair of the Small Business Caucus, I know firsthand the positive economic impact a small business can have on regional and local economies that they serve. In the wake of a natural disaster, small businesses that reopen and rebuild can have a major impact on helping the local economy recover.

Mr. Speaker, as the small business advocate is already involved in communicating with small businesses, requiring the SEC to study issues with access to capital after a natural disaster and report annually on its finding is common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Ms. VELÁZQUEZ for taking the initiative on this important issue, and I encourage my colleagues to support her legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to start off by thanking both Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for working with me on this legislation and moving it onto the floor. This has truly been a bipartisan effort.

My bill, H.R. 4792, the Small Business Access to Capital After a Natural Disaster Act, is simple and straightforward.

One of the most important functions of the SEC's Office of the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation is to develop proposals and recommend changes to Congress that will promote the interests of small businesses and their investors, mitigate their problems, and help them secure access to credit.

When we created the Advocate's Office in 2016, we specifically charged it with looking into the unique challenges facing minority- and women-owned small businesses. My bill requires the advocate to now also consider the unique challenges that small businesses affected by hurricanes or other natural disasters have with securing access to credit and work to promote their interests.

I developed this legislation because, as ranking member of the House Small Business Committee, I understand that small businesses are the lifeblood of many communities around the country, and I have witnessed firsthand the terrible impact hurricanes and other natural disasters can have on the economic outlook for small businesses.

For example, in 2012, Superstorm Sandy ripped through the tristate area and decimated many communities along the New Jersey and New York coasts. Toms River, New Jersey, was considered ground zero for the storm.

Half a decade later, the Greater Toms River Chamber of Commerce reports that the small businesses in that community are still trying to recover at a cost of \$600 million in lost ratables, even at this point.

For small businesses in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands trying to recover from the effects of Hurricane Maria, the situation is much worse.

□ 1915

2017 was the costliest year on record for weather and climate disasters in the United States, and the effects of Hurricane Maria on Puerto Rico's small businesses are unprecedented.

Nelson Ramirez, the president of the Centro Unido de Detallistas, a small business advocacy group in San Juan, estimates two-thirds of the island's roughly 45,000 small and midsize businesses have closed at least temporarily, and as many as 10,000 will never reopen.

Small and midsize businesses represent 90 percent of the private companies on the island and about one-third of the workforce. In October, the Puerto Rican Retail Trade Association revealed that a study conducted by economists estimated that the island's small business sector will lose \$8.9 billion in a period of 6 months due to a lack of electricity on the island.

But while the situation in Puerto Rico is unprecedented, this legislation is about more than just Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands. This legislation will serve to drive capital to other areas of our Nation impacted by hurricanes and other natural disasters this past season including Texas; Florida; the U.S. Virgin Islands; and California, which is facing the effects of devastating wildfires and mudslides.

Ninety-nine percent of the companies in Houston are considered small businesses, and most of them do not have the same economic resources as the State's massive oil and medical industries. As a result, these businesses face

a long and expensive road to recovery. This legislation seeks to shorten that distance for those businesses as well.

FEMA estimates that nearly 40 percent of small businesses never reopen after a disaster. Therefore, developing strategies to drive private capital to a community's small business is one of the most efficient uses of private sector capital and one of the most effective ways we in the Federal Government can help an area recover.

Nearly 4 months after Hurricane Maria, the Puerto Rican economy is at a near standstill and thousands of the island's small businesses are teetering towards insolvency. The businesses in southeast Texas, Florida, the Virgin Islands, and California face tough situations as well, and we must do all that we can to help them recover.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for working with me on this important legislation, which passed our committee earlier this month on a wide bipartisan basis, 57-0. I also want to thank Representatives GREEN, SINEMA, and PLASKETT for co-sponsoring this legislation with me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "yes" and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4792.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING MARSHALL COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING VICTIMS

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, January 23, at 7:57 a.m., shots erupted through the commons area of Marshall County High School in Benton, Kentucky, taking the lives of two students and wounding many others.

The school is the cornerstone of life and activity, and the incomprehensible events of last week have shaken the community to its core. In the aftermath of the devastation, a vast network of spirited, compassionate students and alumni have united to support and further strengthen the tight-knit, resilient community of Marshall County.

As students and faculty attempt to return to some semblance of normalcy this week, I am joined by my colleagues from the Kentucky delegation to express our gratitude for the educators and first responders who acted bravely and efficiently.

We pray for the survivors who are continuing to recover from their injuries, and we remember Preston Cope and Bailey Holt, whose young lives were cut tragically short, as well as their families and friends left behind.

Mr. Speaker, please rise and join me in a moment of silence to honor Preston and Bailey.

PROTECT THE INDEPENDENCE AND INTEGRITY OF SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER'S INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, since before his inauguration last year, President Trump, his administration, and its allies have tested the independence and credibility of the FBI.

Since the appointment of Special Counsel Mueller, we have seen these efforts grow into an apparent attempt to stymie Special Counsel Mueller's investigation and protect the administration from potentially being held accountable.

We have seen several pressure tactics employed from the firing of former FBI Director Comey, the ongoing investigation into the FBI's investigation of Hillary Clinton's emails, and most recently, reports of the President's attempt to fire Special Counsel Mueller himself.

This is a clear sign that Congress must act to protect the independence and integrity of the special counsel's investigation. I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to come together in protecting the special counsel from baseless termination and ensuring that his investigation can follow the facts wherever they may lead.

CELEBRATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTH FLORIDA RED CROSS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Red Cross South Florida.

The Red Cross opened its first south Florida chapter in 1918 in order to meet the demands of World War I. In the century since, its wonderful volunteers and trained personnel have valiantly responded to our most critical needs during national disasters and other catastrophes.

While this organization has significantly grown and expanded into five chapters, it still has remained true to its core mission, which is to be a vital source of relief for disaster victims while helping to prevent, to prepare for, and to respond to emergencies across 13 counties.

Mr. Speaker, by caring for the most vulnerable members of our society, the local Red Cross chapter has become a cornerstone of our south Florida community. So today I would like to congratulate all of the staff and the volunteers of the South Florida Red Cross for a century of dedication of service and of excellence.

Thank you for serving as stewards of the Red Cross legacy and for continuing to provide compassionate care to all who need it.

Congratulations to all.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF JAMES "JIM" CARNEY

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor James "Jim" Carney for his selfless service to residents of the 10th District as a firefighter in our communities for more than 2 decades.

Sadly, Jim passed away last month after a heroic 3½-year battle with cancer. Jim was a native of the 10th District, born in Waukegan, grew up in Wadsworth, and attended Warren Township High School.

After studying at Columbia Southern University, Jim returned home to serve as an on-call member of the Newport Township Fire Protection District in Wadsworth and received his paramedic license. Later, in 2000, he joined the Lincolnshire-Riverwoods Fire Protection District and eventually earned the rank of lieutenant.

Jim was both respected and beloved by his fellow firefighters. They remember him for his calm under pressure and for the welcome he extended to the new members of the department.

"Jim was the kindest person you could ever meet, and he showed everyone respect," recalled his close friend and colleague, Steve Shetsky, in the Lincolnshire Review.

Jim's memory is one of willingness to put his own life in danger to save those of his neighbors, and our communities are incredibly grateful for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my most sincere condolences to Jim's wife, Janelle; to his children, Peyton and Brett; and to many family, friends, and colleagues who mourn his loss.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHNNY NELSON

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, last week, God called home a true icon of Katy, Texas: Johnny Nelson.

Katy was a little rice farming town when I moved there in 1972, to southeast Texas. It was forever changed by Johnny. He served as our mayor from 1983 to 1987, and as our senior administrator from 1994 to 2014. Those were glorious years for Katy, Texas.

He was the force behind the Katy Mills Mall and the Katy Heritage Museum. A true Texan, Johnny was a rice farmer and a cattleman, and we all loved his trademark cigar and cowboy hat.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by paraphrasing another Texas icon, Bum Phillips, the coach of the Houston Oilers, who said: "Johnny Nelson may not be in a class by himself, but whatever class he's in, it don't take long to call the roll."

Thank you, Johnny. Welcome home.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SANDY CASEY

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Sandy Casey.

Sandy had a great impact on the students and family she worked with as a special education teacher at Manhattan Beach Middle School. She was passionate about her work and was committed to continuing her own learning. Sandy would take on new projects that came her way, and she was devoted to all of her students.

Sandy attended Route 91 Harvest Music Festival in Las Vegas with her fiancé, Chris, and her friend. She is remembered by her community as a fun-loving, free spirit who was a compassionate and loyal friend.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my condolences to Sandy Casey's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

CONGRATULATING BEAU ALLEN

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Beau Allen, a Minnetonka High School graduate and defensive tackle for the Philadelphia Eagles, who is now on his way to play in the Super Bowl after a strong performance in the NFC Championship Game just a week ago.

Beau graduated from Minnetonka High School in 2010, and he is the only Minnetonka student in history to start all 4 years. After graduating, he went on to play for Wisconsin and didn't miss a game in his 4 years on that team. And then, in 2014, Beau was a seventh-round NFL pick and joined the Philadelphia Eagles.

He is a key member of the team's defensive line rotation. The Eagles' defense is now ranked first against the run, the fourth in the points allowed, and fourth overall.

As a Vikings fan, I was crushed that our season ended the way that it did, but it is exciting to see someone from our community now being able to play

in the Super Bowl. I look forward to seeing Minnetonka represented on the field this Sunday.

Good luck, Beau.

□ 1930

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER FUNDING

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call out our Republican colleagues for still having left community health centers falling off a funding cliff for this year.

Long-term funding for community health centers expired last September 30. These health centers serve more than 25 million patients in all States in this Union and U.S. territories and employ over 50,000 professionals in the health field nationwide.

In Ohio, more than 85 percent of health center patients fall below 200 percent of the poverty line—the poorest of the poor. In 2015, Ohio health centers served over 600,000 patients—over half a million.

Don't our Republican colleagues understand an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure?

Community health centers remain the Nation's largest source of primary, comprehensive care for medically underserved populations. They are fundamental to life in our communities and neighborhoods, whether they be urban, rural, or small town.

In 2015, America celebrated 50 years of the success of community health centers. This Congress and its Republican majority should not continue to let our constituents down who rely so heavily upon these health centers in life-and-death situations.

KANSAS DAY

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Kansas Day, a recognition of my home State's 157 years of statehood.

Kansas was accepted into the Union as a free State in 1861. Kansans remain resilient, and we work hard to meet the challenges of today; after all, our State motto, "Ad astra per aspera," means to the stars through difficulties.

The Sunflower State has long been known for its wheat product, but today our agriculture industry is more diverse than ever. Kansas is home to the fastest growing dairy herd and is second in the Nation in the number of cattle and calves.

From the farms to our universities, Kansas is leading the charge on research and innovation in agriculture, biosecurity, aviation, medicine, and basketball.

Mr. Speaker, the proof is in the pudding. Kansans are leaders, and we have

a long history of producing innovators. Walter Chrysler, Amelia Earhart, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Bob Dole are just a few of the many Kansans who helped shape our Nation and advance our society.

As I travel through my district and the State, I see the economic hardships our farmers and producers face, but I also see optimism and hope. I am proud to celebrate my home State today and every day as I represent the people of the big First District of Kansas.

CONGRATULATING RASUL DOUGLAS ON MAKING IT TO THE SUPER BOWL

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, hard work pays off. Rasul Douglas, a graduate of East Orange Campus High School in East Orange, New Jersey, is now a cornerback for the Philadelphia Eagles. This Sunday he will play in the Super Bowl.

Rasul is one of seven siblings raised by his grandmother. He spent his first 2 years of college at Nassau Community College where he trekked 50 miles from home to class and practice every day, slept on the floor, and sometimes went hungry in pursuit of his dream.

Rasul transferred to West Virginia University and was then selected by the Eagles in the third round of the 2017 NFL draft.

Mr. Speaker, Rasul Douglas' success is a testament to how far a good work ethic can take you. Rasul is a shining star for young people in my district. Even a Giants fan like me can recognize talent like his.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish Rasul and the Eagles good luck in this weekend's Super Bowl.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the most aggressively pro-growth tax reform package passed since the Reagan administration.

Each day, we learn about a new business giving a substantial bonus to its employees, increasing wages, or reinvesting into their communities because of tax reform. Today, ExxonMobil announced that they would invest an additional \$50 billion in the United States due to this law. Many Arizonans are seeing the benefits from businesses such as Boeing, Waste Management, and Arizona Public Service, just to name a few.

According to Americans for Tax Reform: "At least 3 million Americans are receiving special tax reform bonuses." These successes are taking place long before tax reform has even

been implemented fully. Most Americans have yet to learn how much more money they will see in their paychecks.

Mr. Speaker, tax reform has placed us on the right course to keep our booming economy humming at a good clip and sets the trajectory for even more significant growth in the future. I predict a very prosperous new year.

STANDING FOR THE PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a couple of hours ago, the Republicans on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence voted to release the Nunes report. At the same time, they voted not to allow the rebuttal offered by the Democrats to be released.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, as a Member who has been through impeachment of the Federal judiciary and a President, not one time did I see any sidetrack opportunities or efforts to dismantle that ongoing investigation.

We are not in an impeachment proceeding. We have a special counsel that is attempting to provide for the American people a detailed and thoughtful investigation.

Why the rule of law has been so obliterated by our Republican friends and the idea of democracy and the protection of the institutions of this Nation have been undermined, I am shocked.

The American people are not clamoring for the destruction of the FBI, nor are they clamoring for the destruction and undermining of Special Counsel Mueller's report.

Let us stand for the principles of democracy and the Constitution. This kind of undermining is dastardly and embarrassing.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TIM NELSON

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Tim Nelson, a beloved father, husband, community leader, and football coach who passed away on January 16, after a courageous battle against colorectal cancer since 2013.

Despite spending weeks receiving treatment in the hospital and going in and out of remission, Tim's resolve and bravery in his battle against this disease never wavered.

The support he and his family received in the Metro East and the River Bend never wavered either. A member of the Calhoun High School's 1992 State championship football team, Tim served as head football coach at Marquette Catholic High School in Alton and Duplo High School before returning to his home school, Calhoun High School, as an assistant in 2013.

Each of these communities and the entire region never stopped rallying around Tim and his family. I am proud to honor him and his life in this Chamber, and I ask you to join me in keeping his wife, Casey; and young son, Crew, in your thoughts and prayers.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF PAUL BOOTH

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I come before this body today with a heavy heart. A dear friend of mine, Mr. PAUL Booth, we lost him 12 days ago to leukemia. Mr. Booth was a man who dedicated his life to the simple idea of fairness—fairness for workers, fairness in all aspects of life.

Paul Booth was a leading adviser to nearly every union president over the last several years at the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. He also worked hard to lift up dignity in all aspects of his life.

He was a student organizer and brought attention to the folly of the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war, and he had been active in making Americans' lives better his entire life.

He understood the very simple idea that working people have dignity and that they must be treated to reflect that dignity by their government. He also understood that the linkage between hard work and prosperity should always be close and tight. He recognized that, in our country today, you can work very hard and still only make it. That is why he was one of the first people to work for a living wage policy in this country. He was fighting for a living wage before it was popular.

Paul Booth also happened to have a marvelous partner. Her name is Heather Booth, and everybody knows Heather.

But I just want to say, when people who make a life of service pass from this life, it is important that we recognize the tremendous debt we owe them.

I want to thank Paul and Heather Booth for their mentorship of me and for their service to our country.

RECOGNIZING KANGA ROOF IN BUCKS COUNTY

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a company in my district that is making a huge impact by giving back to our community. Kanga Roof, a company that has been providing roofing in the Bucks County area for over 30 years, celebrated its 10th Holiday Roof Giveaway this past December.

Every year for the past 10 years, Kanga Roof has held a contest to provide a new roof to a deserving family in our community. This year, they selected my constituent, Bettemarie

Bond, who is a tireless advocate for individuals with mitochondrial disease and those receiving IV infusions and tube feeding, whom I have had the honor of working with on this cause.

Kanga Roof views their annual Holiday Roof Giveaway as a way of giving back to our community and making our community stronger. I would like to commend them on their commitment to our community and to encourage all of our constituents to follow Kanga Roof's lead by being good neighbors and giving back to our community.

WITHDRAWAL OF APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO CONGRESSIONAL AWARD BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's withdrawal of the appointment of the following individual to the Congressional Award Board on January 25, 2018:

Mr. Steve Hart, Washington, D.C.

RELEASE THE FOUR-PAGE MEMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House this evening with several of my colleagues principally to thank Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman TREY GOWDY, and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Chairman DEVIN NUNES for their tireless pursuit of the truth.

There is a four-page memo. I have read it. Over 190 of my Republican colleagues have read it. Some Democrats have read it, and some have boycotted reading it. It details circumstances that are deeply troubling to me and that I believe will be deeply troubling to many Americans.

This memo encapsulates an entire year of work by these committees and by these committee chairmen, and they are to be commended for the excellent job that they have done, for the professionalism that they have undertaken, and for the stunning facts that they have uncovered that will soon be available for the American people.

I will have more to say on this throughout the hour, Mr. Speaker, but first I yield to one of my colleagues in the Congress who was one of the first and loudest voices calling for transparency at the highest levels and to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GAETZ for organizing this important Special Order and all my colleagues for coming to the House floor tonight encouraging the President of the United States now to certify the release of this memo to the American public.

The American public is a lot smarter than a whole lot of other people give them credit for. Present them with the facts and the truth, and they can form their own independent judgment as to what transpired. That was the first thought that came to my mind when I went to the basement a week before last—the basement of the House Capitol—to read this classified memo of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, that this memo should be immediately released to the American public so that they have all of the facts.

In addition to releasing the memo, I believe it is important to be releasing relevant material sourced in the memo.

Now, tonight, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence voted to publicly release this memo to the American public, and, at the same time, the House Democrats came to the committee calling for the declassification and public release of their memo.

□ 1945

Let me add a little bit more context on this memo that the House Democrats came to the floor asking to be released.

They did not allow the voting members of the House Intelligence Committee to read the memo tonight before voting to declassify and publicly release it.

Let me repeat that. The House Democrats, led by Ranking Member ADAM SCHIFF, went to the House Intelligence Committee tonight calling for the public release of their memo, asking for their colleagues to declassify the memo and to publicly release it immediately, without giving them the opportunity to read it first.

I can speak for myself. I haven't read the memo that the House Democrats offered up tonight. I haven't been granted any access to read it. I am not aware of any other of my colleagues who have been able to read it. I can't even confirm it exists.

After the committee met, it was fascinating to watch the minority members of the House Intelligence Committee going straight from the hearing room to the cameras to give their narrative. At no point did they mention whatsoever, when they were saying that they were outraged that the majority members of that committee didn't vote to publicly release it, at no point did they mention that they never gave them the opportunity to read it first.

What you don't see, at the same time, are the majority members of the House Intelligence Committee racing off to all those same cameras to give their same side of the narrative, the members of that House Intelligence Committee.

What we are asking for is the American public to get the facts so that they can form the judgment of this FISA abuse for themselves.

I, too, applaud the leadership of Mr. NUNES and the House Intelligence Com-

mittee for their work to restore faith with the American people.

As a former Army intelligence officer and JAG officer myself, I understand the importance of giving our intelligence agencies the critical tools they need to protect our homeland, assist our troops on the front lines, and surveil our enemies. However, it is critical that we strike a balance between national security and civil liberty to prevent any gross violation of individual liberties under the guise of national security.

Congress has the responsibility of ensuring an appropriate balance is struck, and when it is not, to release information we feel is in the national interest and of public importance. Today, Congress took an important step in making this possible.

Americans deserve the truth. To pull the wool over the eyes of the American public insults their intelligence and debases the freedoms and liberties on which our government was founded. Government transparency and accountability should be neither partisan nor divisive.

I would urge my colleagues on either side of the aisle, especially those who have voted against its release, to evaluate and reflect upon their position and come together united in favor of our belief that the American public is a lot smarter than many give them credit for. Give them the facts, and we have faith they will be able to form their own independent conclusions.

Now it is up to the President. I would encourage him to release the memo. I would also encourage him to release relevant material sourced in it. Americans have the right know. If we as their elected Representatives fail to stand up for them, who will?

The only way forward is to give the American public more information, not less. Release the memo.

I thank Congressman MATT GAETZ for his leadership throughout this entire process and his efforts to make sure the American public learns more, not less.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his persuasive leadership. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) was one of the first to sign letters to members of the House Intelligence Committee, and particularly its chairman, expressing the sense of this body that we supported the transparency that the gentleman spoke of.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and for putting this hour together.

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the secret memo in a secure setting. After having reviewed the contents of the classified memo relating to FISA abuses, I support its full release to the public. Americans deserve the truth, and Congress should always strive for transparency.

I am stunned at the previous administration's underhanded surveillance methods and misuse of power at the highest levels of the FBI and Department of Justice. This should never have been permitted to happen.

Moreover, all Federal agencies, including the FBI, should be held to a high standard and always be held accountable for their actions. The issues that the memo raises must be brought to light and dealt with responsibly.

I am pleased that the House Intelligence Committee voted tonight to release the memo, but our work does not end there. We must continually strive for integrity and openness within all levels of government.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), who serves on the Judiciary Committee. He has worked very hard from the very beginning to ascertain the bases of claims made and is a true investigator at heart.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for leading tonight's Special Order. It has been an eye-opening year in office for me, and it is an honor to serve with Representative GAETZ on the Judiciary Committee in the pursuit of justice.

Exactly 11 nights ago, Mr. Speaker, I walked into a secure vault, signed one of the most detailed nondisclosure documents I have ever seen, and viewed "the memo." Everything I read was what I expected to read. That is what is outrageous to me. There was not much that I did not expect to find.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Chairman GOWDY, Chairman NUNES, and members of the House Intelligence Committee who have now voted to present that memo to the public. I am looking forward to President Trump shortly declassifying that memo permanently.

I have heard people say to me: You are eroding trust in government and in the finest law enforcement agency in the country, the FBI, with your continual attacks. But they don't understand that we are not attacking the FBI. We are seeking clarity, transparency, and an understanding of what went on under the leadership of the Department of Justice and the FBI in the previous administration. To not reveal that to the public is what erodes trust in their government.

Nothing in this memo will impair our national security. But if we are to withhold this memo from the American people, I believe that, instead, would harm our national security because it would harm the integrity of those agencies, and it would further erode the trust that Americans have in their government.

The American people deserve to see the information that I have read, that Mr. GAETZ has read, and that over 100 Members of Congress have read. The leadership of Chairman DEVIN NUNES has made a tremendous difference, and this truth will be exposed. I congratulate him.

Mr. Speaker, this memo will provide clarity and understanding. This is the memo, when it gets out, where the people will say: We need to make changes. We have got to have people in these law enforcement agencies and that lead these agencies and these bodies be trustworthy, follow the law, and not abuse their power for political gain or purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I trust my constituents. Frankly, in the last week, I met with literally hundreds of my constituents. The most common theme talked about was: When will that classified memo be released so I can read it, so I can make a determination, so I can understand what has been going on in our government?

I am so pleased that the House Intelligence Committee voted today to answer the question. In short order you will be able to read this and make up your own mind. That is why I encourage President Trump to quickly declassify the memo.

Again, I thank my colleague, Representative GAETZ, and all who have been working on this issue to make this memo open and transparent for the people.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his service on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), another of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida; he has definitely been a leader on this issue.

I have got to tell you that I, too, am happy the Intelligence Committee has agreed to release the memo. When I was back home in Texas last week, it was the number one issue people were talking to me about.

I want to take a minute and step back and do a little bit of a history lesson.

The Fourth Amendment to our Constitution arose from some of the abusive practices that were going on in the Colonies. The King of England would send his troops to rifle through people's effects without a warrant. Our Fourth Amendment said we are not going to let that happen in these new United States of America. We are going to require the government to get a warrant before they go through people's papers. We are protected from illegal searches.

I have been worried since the first day I got here in Congress, but in our effort to protect ourselves—and perhaps out of fear, some of it, perhaps, warranted—we are eroding those rights.

So, as this memo comes out, regardless of what is in it, we need to be looking at the process: how we went to a secret court to get permission to get this information, how that information was gathered, what that information was, who vetted it, how thoroughly it was vetted, how the judges reacted, and,

eventually, what came out and determined whether we need to reform that process to protect Americans' rights.

Yes, we all have a right to know what is going on with our government. Yes, I am worried about career bureaucrats or elected officials abusing the power of the government to get information on their political enemies, like the King was doing back in the days of the Revolutionary War. This is our opportunity to make sure that doesn't happen in these United States.

Let's not lose sight of what the issue is here, and that is protecting the people not only from foreigners who look to do us harm, but also from an oppressive government that abuses its power to spy on American citizens.

I am glad this memo is going to come out. I urge President Trump to promptly release it and, in fact, go beyond that: look at some of the sources of the material in it, determine that we can reveal some of those sources without jeopardizing our ability to gather intelligence, and release the source materials so we know what people knew when they made the decision to pursue the material covered in this memo.

I think this is a great time for this country. I think this is our opportunity to remind ourselves that we do have a right to be safe and secure in our persons and papers from a government that may be trying to do more than protect us.

Maybe some of these folks in the government have shifted from what we need to protect America, such as, well, the best way to protect America is to protect ourselves and our jobs and our political agenda.

That is not what the job of our law enforcement and intelligence community is. It is to protect us from those who want to do us harm, especially foreigners. I want to give them the power to do that, the ability to do that, but I do not want to give them the ability to affect elections, to go after their political enemies, to spy on any one of us because they can.

Human nature is such that, if we give the government too much power, there are those who will abuse it. So we in Congress have got to keep our eye on the ball at all times and protect the constitutional rights that our forefathers and our Founding Fathers gave us and that our men and women in uniform fight for every day that they are in service to this country.

□ 2000

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a fellow member of the Judiciary Committee, another of the first Members of Congress to demand the appointment of a second special counsel to look into matters such as this.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) for yielding to me. I appreciate the gentleman for taking the lead on this issue back some weeks or months ago to bring a resolution to the House

Judiciary Committee to call for special counsel to more broadly investigate all of the defugalties that have been taking place in this country, driven by political partisanship on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I look back and I think about what the attitude was of President Trump—actually, even before the election and shortly after—when I listened to him, and he more or less expressed this sentiment, which was that, with Hillary Clinton and her transgressions and the way she had handled the classified material and up to the secret server next to the bathroom up in New York in her place, essentially, the President's position was that we need to move America forward. We should not be dug deeply into going backwards on this or looking back over our shoulder. Let's move forward. The public has litigated this in the election.

Now, I think that is where President Trump wanted it to be, but it wasn't to be because the left could not accept the idea that the American people had spoken. They began to manufacture and continue the manufacture this Russian investigation, these allegations that were collusion allegations with the Russians to try to manipulate an American election.

I don't think anybody doubts that the Russians made some effort at that, but all of us doubt that they had any impact whatsoever on our election. Those of us, at least on this side of the aisle, have seen zero information and zero evidence that the campaign of President Trump had any kind of relationship that went on with the Russians, that promoted it or colluded in any way. But because there needed to be some explanation for this phenomenal Presidential election of Donald Trump, we had to be drug back into this Russian investigation over and over again. Now, this began within 2 weeks of the President's election, after about November 8 or so.

Then as that unfolded, Mr. Speaker, then we saw what was really going on here. We got into about February or March of last year. At that point, I said: They are not going to relent on this Russian investigation business. They are going to continue to belabor this point. The election has already been settled and it is not in question, as far as the results of the polls are concerned. We have a President. Let's honor the President. Let's honor the will of the American people. Let's respect the decision made at the polls.

But, instead, the pressure continued on and on, allegations complicit with the mainstream media, the fake news, as we have now finally come to know them, I think, by habit and fact. At that point, I said: If they will not let up, then it is going to be an obligation to dig and drill deeply into all of the things that bring us together, from Huma Abedin and Anthony Weiner all the way across the board, from Hillary and the sham investigation, the questioning of her on July 2, 2016, on and on

throughout the whole spectrum of things.

It became an obligation to drill to the complete bottom of all of the allegations that had been made from the investigation that surely didn't look legitimate to us, as Mr. GAETZ and I and others on the Judiciary Committee began to question people from the FBI and the people from the Justice Department and, at that time, James Comey, the Director of the FBI. We put those pieces together.

Each one of those little incidents that were testified to kind of stood up okay on their own, but when you put them together in the string of it had to be an unbelievable string of coincidences that were presented before the Judiciary Committee and the other committees here on the Hill, it became clear to us, initiated by Mr. GAETZ, that we need to go much more deeply into this and much more quickly. A good number of us supported a resolution to call for special counsel.

Now, I support the idea of an additional special counsel to broaden this. I would write the language even more broadly than the original resolution. But we should keep in mind what is going on on this Hill today, that is, that there are, by my count, at least, seven different congressional committees that are investigating this broad picture of the subject matter that we are discussing here today.

On top of that, we have Robert Mueller's investigation as a special counsel. Additionally, we have an IG investigation going on in the Justice Department under Michael Horowitz.

Michael Horowitz has a good reputation. He has about 450 investigators all together, all of whom are probably not working on this. I would be surprised if they were. So there are seven reports from committees that will eventually come out, Mr. Speaker, and one from Robert Mueller that is going to come out and one from the IG that is going to come out.

This is pretty confusing to try to understand the subject matter that they are addressing. It is defined a little bit differently from committee to committee and from the assigned investigation groups, but I will envision this:

Our Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, sits there in the Justice Department having, in an honorable way, recused himself from the Russian investigation, which keeps his hands off of that. The recommendation, as I understand that, came from Rod Rosenstein, the acting U.S. Attorney General in the event that Jeff Sessions isn't there to be the Attorney General. That was in the recommendation, by the testimony that I believe I remember, that Jeff Sessions should recuse himself from the Russian investigation, and that is the man who made the appointment of Robert Mueller.

So when I look at this whole picture, our Attorney General's job is a tough one, but it is one I think he can do bet-

ter than anyone else in this country or on this planet, and that is make sense of all of these investigations, seven congressional investigations, an IG investigation, and a special counsel's investigation. That adds up to nine, by my estimation.

Now, people are human. So that says to me that these assignments of these investigations are either going to overlap or there are going to be gaps. When you have nine of them all together, there will be overlapping and there will be gaps. Where there are overlaps, there is likely to be some contradiction.

So the job of the Attorney General is to look at this whole picture and put this back together in a way that you can figure out what the contradictions are, fill in the gaps, investigate the places that haven't been investigated by the assignments of these various committees and the special counsel, and then deliver to the American people the right kind of view on the justice that needs to come. If there are indictments, to make that call for those indictments, clearly and unequivocally, based upon factual evidence.

That is why I support this memo being released in the vote of the Select Committee on Intelligence today. It is essential that the American people get to the truth. They can't absorb this truth all in one day. It has to come out a piece at a time because we are human and they are human.

So I encourage the Attorney General to keep his hand on this in the steady way that he has. I am very confident that the decisions made on the Select Committee on Intelligence are the correct ones, and I am very confident that the President will make a decision to release the memo so the American people can get at the truth. How far the truth takes us, history will write that book.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for putting this all together here this evening.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for being a clarion voice for calling this Congress and this administration to act in a way that is consistent with the values and the principles of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 33 minutes remaining.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I will not take that full allotment of time. I will say, though, that it is worth repeating the great work that Chairman BOB GOODLATTE has done in the Judiciary Committee; the excellent work that TREY GOWDY has done, the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee; and the excellent work that Chairman DEVIN NUNES has done. Each of these committees has jurisdiction over a different component part of the information that is laid out before the American people that has given

rise to so many concerns about bias, departure from standard practices, familial relationships, and the potential political corrosion of institutions that we have to rely on for an effective democracy.

I also want to thank the thousands of people who work in the FBI and the Department of Justice who are patriots, who go to work every day to protect us from threats at home and abroad, who really do do a great job in defense of this country. It is not their work that we question; in fact, it is their work we hope to empower.

When you have circumstances where folks at the head shed or the leading bureaucrats can rip investigations away from field offices, can alter the contents of information that is shared with the American people, it undermines the work that true law enforcement members are doing. We want to highlight and honor that work while, at the same time, exercising our oversight function to go after the bad conduct and, where we find it systemic, institute reforms so that it does not happen again.

The FBI and the Department of Justice should never be a political weapon used to go after adversaries. This is an issue where we ought to have more bipartisan agreement, Mr. Speaker. While I am grateful that the Republicans on the Intelligence Committee this evening were able to carry the day in the fight for transparency, I am disappointed that these issues led to party-line votes.

The reality is that all Americans—Republican, Democrat, Independent, Libertarian, or members of the Whig Party—have an interest in ensuring that we have systems in place that protect our constitutional rights and liberties. We all have a stake in the action to ensure that, no matter which party wins or loses an election, the political apparatus of intelligence won't be used to go after enemies or people we disagree with.

I believe this was an opportunity missed, but it won't be the last one. I believe that the President is going to declassify this information within the 5-day window allowed to him. When he does, all Americans will see why Republicans have been concerned with the information we have learned. Then the opportunity will arise to work together, to take these facts, to take what we know, and to liberate ourselves from the partisanship of this town and to try to make things better so that, in the future, you don't have a circumstance where one investigation is called a headquarter special and taken away from the Washington field office, as the Hillary Clinton email scandal was.

We certainly don't want cases where people's family members—familial relationships, spousal relationships—influence the outcomes of decisions; and we also don't want systems in place that allow leaks to the media within the apparatus of intelligence to cloud

our mind, to cloud our judgment, to cloud the facts, or to cloud the review of our courts.

So, again, while I am proud of the work of the people who have spent a year investigating these matters, while I am confident in the findings of this report, I still remain disappointed that we don't have more unity to ensure that these types of abuses never happen again.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the President of the United States will walk down the center aisle. He will address this floor. There might be a few more folks than there are here this evening. I hope that the first thing he does is hand to the Speaker of the House his consent and his agreement to allow transparency to rein, to declassify this memo, to put it before the American people, and then let's have a great debate about its consequences and about the opportunity that it presents to make things better so that these things never happen again.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

□ 2015

A THREAT TO LABOR UNIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I stand to anchor this special hour because this Nation is faced with a very serious threat. As a matter of fact, it is a devious threat to the labor unions, our great labor unions that have played a most fundamental role in establishing the greatness of the economy of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this evening, first I want to thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. CEDRIC RICHMOND from Louisiana, for his great leadership. I appreciate him giving me this opportunity to anchor this special hour.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the staffs of the CBC, Ms. Caren Street, who has worked very closely with my staffer, Ms. Seema Ibrahim, who has done a remarkable job.

Our whole team of many Congressmen from every sector of this country, every part of this country, is going to come before this House of Representatives in these next 60 minutes to explain and expose to the American people two important things.

First of all, we want to illustrate our deep understanding of the great value of the labor unions to this great country.

We also want to expose the great threat that is now being faced by our labor unions. The first group of our labor unions that is facing this threat are the public sector unions, most pointedly because in a matter of a few weeks, the Supreme Court will take up a case, *Janus v. AFSCME*.

This *Janus* case is designed to remove what has already been established as the constitutionality of public service unions to be able to mandate fees and dues for their membership, which will be a catastrophic threat to the survival of these unions. So we want to explain that. We want to also share the greatness of this. So this is where we are.

I want to ask those who are listening over C-SPAN tonight all across this country to call a neighbor, call a friend, tell them to tune in and listen to these Members of Congress pour out the truth about what is at stake with this *Janus* court case that will be coming up before the Supreme Court.

The first union that will be dealt with is AFSCME, but it is far more than just AFSCME. It is the public sector unions that will be ruled as to whether it is constitutional or not for them to have dues to be able to play.

This case comes from an individual, Mr. *Janus*, in Illinois who disagreed with political endorsements.

What is important to understand going forward, Mr. Speaker, is that the constitutionality has already been upheld.

On top of that, if there is any union member who does not agree with those political endorsements, he has a right to get a financial rebate for that part of the dues that will go to political endorsements.

So if Mr. *Janus*' concerns have been dealt with, then why this case?

That is the Achilles' heel that will prove the deviousness of what is before us.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I bring on our first speaker. This gentleman, Representative BOBBY SCOTT, is the ranking member of our Education and the Workforce Committee. On top of that, he is a fierce fighter for working families and he is a leader in making sure that labor unions will continue to have the rights that they fought so hard for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, unions empower workers with the freedom to negotiate for a fair return on their work and they provide a collective voice to advocate for policies that benefit working people.

Union workers, including those in the public sector, have more access to paid leave, medical and retirement benefits, and higher pay than workers who are not unionized. Children of union members experience more upward mobility than children of workers who are not covered with union contracts, and States with higher union density have stronger workplace protections.

There is a long history of unions helping the least powerful secure dignity on the job. This is the 50th anniversary of the Memphis sanitation workers' strike in 1968. After two workers were crushed in garbage compactors, the Memphis sanitation workers peacefully protested for better pay and safer working conditions. They sought representation from the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, or AFSCME. They marched with placards that simply stated: "I am a man."

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., long recognized that the fight for civil rights was fundamentally linked to economic justice and he gave his last public address before his assassination on behalf of these workers.

Despite police brutality and the deployment of 4,000 National Guardsmen, the strike was ultimately successful and AFSCME negotiated higher wages and safer conditions.

The unions representing the workers in the public sector continue to empower our workers and communities today. Just this month, when temperatures plunged to dangerous lows, the Baltimore Teachers Union fought for children who were forced to bundle up in coats and hats in their own classrooms because there was no heat in their schools.

Around the country, the SEIU represented hundreds of thousands of healthcare workers who provide in-home healthcare for our Nation's elderly and disabled. In many States, these workers are State employees, and the unions play a crucial role in bargaining for better wages, better training, and in advocating for increased Medicaid funding so they can deliver services to the disabled and the elderly.

Despite the great work these unions have done on behalf of working people, they are constantly under attack by corporate interests determined to cripple the labor movement, and we know why.

Big corporations and the top 1 percent have rigged our economy against working people. They have gamed the system, including our tax laws, to redistribute wealth to a select few. They have starved our economy of investments in education, infrastructure, and housing.

The campaign to weaken unions has contributed to extreme income inequality and wage stagnation, as smaller and smaller shares of corporate earnings are paid in wages.

The latest of these attacks is happening in the Supreme Court. On February 26, the Court will hear oral arguments in *Janus v. AFSCME*, Council 31, on the question of whether or not to overturn 40 years of precedence affirming the principle that public employees who choose not to join a union may be required to pay a fair share fee to cover the costs of collective bargaining and contract enforcement.

In 1977, the Supreme Court ruled in *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education* that fair share States may authorize the payment of fair share fees to support unions' collective bargaining on behalf of employees. The Court found that the fair share fees are constitutional under the First Amendment because they support collective bargaining, not political activities.

This practice fosters States' interests in preventing labor disputes, cures the free rider problem of employees benefiting from union representation while shifting the costs to their coworkers, and improves the delivery of services by State and local governments.

In *Janus*, the plaintiffs want to overturn laws in 23 States and the District of Columbia that now require public sector workers who decide not to be members of the union to pay a fair share fee. These workers enjoy all of the benefits of the union: higher wages, safer workplaces, effective grievance procedures.

In these fair share States today, public and private employees who do not want to join a union may be required to pay their fair share for expenses for services required by law, not political, but the services required by law to benefit all workers.

Janus seeks to overturn that law and allow people to benefit from all of those services without paying their fair share.

The challenge to the long-serving precedence is the latest move by corporate interests to weaponize the First Amendment against working people. We have seen it before in *Citizens United*, which used freedom of speech in the First Amendment to justify virtually unlimited corporate contributions to political campaigns.

Here in the House of Representatives, we frequently see similar antiunion attacks dedicated to weakening the labor movement's ability to function as an advocate for working people and as a counterweight to corporate power.

Whether in the Supreme Court or here in Congress, the campaign to weaken unions is a campaign to strip workers of their most basic protections. This is why it is crucial for Congress to defend against any attacks to undermine workers' freedom to negotiate for better wages and better working conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for organizing this Special Order.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

It is very important, as he has mentioned, to note that we are talking about not just AFSCME, as I said, but we are talking about nurses unions, educators, the teachers that teach our children, our police, firefighters, everyone. It is very important that the people of this country really get informed about this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative DWIGHT EVANS, who normally anchors this hour and does a great job.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the great State of Georgia for introducing me and for this opportunity to talk about an important Supreme Court case, *Janus v. AFSCME*, Council 31, and the importance of our unions.

Our unions give us much to celebrate in our neighborhoods nationwide.

As we know all too well, this case stands to destabilize collective bargaining rights within the public sector. This is clearly an attack on freedom and liberties of hardworking Americans.

We are in the business of doing no harm. That is what we should be.

All that this case aims to do is take away the rights of the ability of hardworking Americans to have a strong voice in their workplace. That is just not right.

Next month, the Supreme Court will hear the oral arguments in this case to determine whether fair share fees violate the First Amendment rights of workers.

When it comes to this case, a negative decision for our unions nationwide would take us in the wrong direction.

Across the country, more than half of African-American workers and nearly 60 percent of Latino workers are paid less than \$15 per hour. Union jobs have historically been, and continue to be, a path to the middle class for people of color, who often face low-wage jobs.

African-American union members today earn 14.7 percent more and Latino workers earn 21.8 percent more than their nonunion counterparts. In some sections, the difference is even greater.

African-American women in unions earn an average of \$21.90 an hour, while nonunion workers earn \$17.04.

□ 2030

In addition, there are more than 72 percent of women in unions who have health insurance, while less than 50 percent of nonunion African-American women do not.

Our unions are a key road to our growing middle class, especially for women and communities of color. Nationwide, our unions continue to be on the frontline of fighting for higher pay, fair wages, safer working conditions,

and better hours to provide for themselves and their families.

I will continue to stand on the frontline of protecting rights for all hardworking Americans. It is up to us to lift up unions in all of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for leading this caucus in this need.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a leader and a fighter from the very State where Mr. *Janus* is from.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for anchoring this session, and all of those who have come to join in it.

I read someplace the other day where there are three men in this country who own as much of the wealth as 50 percent of all the poorest people in this country. If it were not for organized labor, not for unions, and the influence, millions of individuals who are middle class would be working at peon wages. Individuals would not be able to send their children to college, wouldn't be able to own an automobile or a home. So we can never undermine or not understand the value of organization.

Many of us in this room enjoy the support of organized labor. You have got to get resources from somewhere. You have got to get money in order to function.

If you cannot match what the big megabucks individuals can give to maintain control of our society, how do you expect to change it?

So I am simply pleased to join with my colleagues and suggest that nothing is more important in the distribution and redistribution of the wealth of this country than organized labor.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that the gentleman mentioned the important fact of the fantastic role that labor has played. Without organized labor, there would be no middle class in America. There would be no 40-hour workweek. Child labor laws would not be on the books.

The role that organized labor has played cannot be communicated better than our next speaker, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who is a legend in standing up and fighting for working people and labor unions. I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding and for that gracious introduction, but, more importantly, for his magnificent leadership and for constantly looking out for working men and women throughout the country. I also thank him very much for bringing us together this evening to discuss the Supreme Court case, *Janus v. AFSCME*.

Mr. Speaker, as we remember the man and the movement which transformed the soul of America, we must never forget that Dr. Martin Luther

King, Jr., fought for economic justice and workers' rights.

A few months before Dr. King's assassination, two young African-American workers were crushed to death by a faulty truck in Memphis. The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees—AFSCME—union members went on strike, and Dr. King was right there with them, leading and lending his support.

In a speech to the sanitation workers on strike, Dr. King explained why he was there. He said: "Now our struggle is for genuine equality, which means economic equality. For we know that it isn't enough to integrate lunch counters. What does it profit a man to be able to eat at an integrated lunch counter if he doesn't earn enough money to buy a hamburger . . . ?"

Now, 50 years after Dr. King's tragic assassination after standing up for economic justice and fighting to end poverty, the Supreme Court is taking up a case that would gut union rights.

Make no mistake, the Supreme Court case, *Janus v. AFSCME*, is a political scheme to further endanger the rights of working people. This case is yet another attempt by billionaires and corporations to stop working people from joining unions altogether. This case will gut the very protections that are the fabric of our society, and that is our unions.

More than 16 million people are represented by a union, from teachers, firefighters, and nurses, to postal workers, and many more. Unions help improve lives. They increase wages. They lift families out of poverty. They fight for safe working conditions and well-deserved benefits.

Unions are especially critical to communities of color. For too long, African Americans have been locked out of wage increases because of discriminatory practices. But for African Americans who do join unions, they earn 15 percent more than their nonunion counterparts.

African-American women, in particular, earn an average of \$22 an hour compared to \$17 an hour in a nonunion job, and those wages make a huge difference for families.

Plain and simple, unions provide a path to the American Dream and the middle class for working people.

Unfortunately, as union membership has decreased because of attacks on working people, income inequality has risen. From 1973 to 2007, as more States started forcing working people off of unions, income inequality rose by one-third. That is shameful.

So, Mr. Speaker, the *Janus* case before the Supreme Court now threatens the economic security of families all across the country. This case will go against what the American public wants. More than three in five Americans know the importance of labor unions, yet here we are having to defend their very existence. This is outrageous.

So we must ensure that working people, people of color, everyone, continue

to have the right to join a union. It is the right thing for our economy. It is the right thing for our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for leading this very important Special Order tonight.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is so right that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) mentioned Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., because this year is the 50th anniversary of his assassination. And what was he doing?

As you pointed out, he was in Memphis helping the garbage workers. It was Local 1733 that had just got their charter. And when the threats were out about him, they wanted him to leave. He said: "No. I don't know what would happen. We have got some difficult days ahead, but I just want to do God's will."

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), a dear friend, a leader in the fight for unions and working people who loves this Nation immensely, and who works with me on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding. He has pulled us together. Those of us who have been able to work with him over the years, as I have—13 years on the committee—we appreciate the gentleman's work from Georgia's 13th District.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have already very eloquently reminded you of the significance, the history, and the benefits of unions. I want to talk to you about the power of unions, the power to effect change in the workforce.

Next month, the U.S. Supreme Court will hear arguments in *Janus v. AFSCME*. This will decide whether workers can receive all the benefits of a union contract without contributing any funding in return. We call them fair share fees.

Unions work because the workers pay their fair share, and they all benefit from what is negotiated. Each worker chooses whether or not to join a union, but the union is still required by law to represent and negotiate on behalf of all of the workers. Some people want to see an end to that, which is why this case is headed to the U.S. Supreme Court. A negative decision could reverse a 40-year unanimous precedent supporting State's rights.

Now, I want to say that I believe in the power of unions. It allows employees a voice when some of them feel that they have been silenced. When they can't speak and ask for increased wages or a safe working environment for fear of retaliation, the unions speak. The unions are their voices and they demand fair and reasonable working conditions.

We saw that power in 1970 during the Postal Workers' strike. Workers had had enough. And as the gentleman

from Georgia mentioned earlier, we saw that power during the Memphis Sanitation Workers' strike. Workers were willing to sacrifice their lives.

The Reverend James Lawson, a good friend of mine, was a United Methodist pastor in Memphis at the time. He made a phone call to a man he had met about 10 years earlier. Jim Lawson had just gotten out of prison for refusing to go to Korea. Jim Lawson met Martin Luther King after he got out of prison. They both ended up in India, studying under Gandhi.

Jim Lawson realized that Martin Luther King had started this organization with four others called the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, so he called him and said: "Would you come to Memphis? We need you to help with this sanitation workers' strike."

It is little known that when Dr. King tried to get the SCLC board to vote to come to Memphis, they were not in support. Dr. King struggled around a couple of days by himself, and then let everybody know on the board he was going to go by himself. That, of course, changed everybody else's minds and they joined him in Memphis.

We all know what happened to Martin Luther King, Jr., when he went to Memphis. He was killed on the balcony of the Lorraine Motel. He sacrificed his life for workers, the people who built this country.

I owe my "middle classness" to my maternal and my paternal grandfathers. Both of them worked for the Southern Pacific Railroad and became members of a union and earned enough money to buy a house.

In my little town where I was born, Waxahachie, Texas, an African American owning his own home, not a shanty?

So it inspired his three boys, one of which was my father, to raise his four kids in a middle class way. We all went off to college. We owe that not only to the ingenuity of my grandfather and my parents, but also to the unions.

So I will support unions as long as I can. Long after I am out of Congress, I intend to support unions because they have power to change lives. I am an example.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Reverend Cleaver for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, there are 7.1 million members of just the public sector unions. Thirty-four percent of all of the employees in public service belong to unions, and this Supreme Court case would be devastating to these 7.1 million families.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), who serves on the very influential Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, for anchoring this very important Special Order this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with my colleagues in this very important

discussion about fair share fees for union workers.

□ 2045

In 1977, the Supreme Court, in *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, decided that fair share fees were constitutional, full stop. This decision allowed unions to be paid fair share fees by nonunion members in order to negotiate on their behalf.

Fair share fees have become increasingly significant and important, as unions continue to fight for worker protections in the workplace.

Now, 40 years later, the Supreme Court is poised to hear this issue yet again in *Janus v. AFSCME*.

So what has changed? What has changed?

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that this is yet another attempt to put big business above working people and weaken organized labor as effective representatives for the working class.

I, therefore, ask the Court to be thoughtful. I ask that they think of the consequences that will follow by reversing this law. I ask the Court not to be used as pawns by the Republican conservatives, millionaires and billionaires, to weaken organized labor and unions of the 21st century.

If it were not for organized labor, many of us would not be standing here representing our constituents today. My mother was a member of DC 37, a part of AFSCME, and it was through her labor union, her local, that she was able to put money aside for my brother and me to go to college, to make sure that our healthcare was taken care of.

And here we are in the wealthiest Nation in the world where millionaires and billionaires are lining their pockets with profits, and, at the same time, we have workers who are before the Supreme Court just seeking dignity to be organized through labor and labor unions.

This is a time for all Americans to remember their roots. Organized labor is part of the bedrock of this Nation. It is my hope that the Supreme Court will remember that in their deliberations.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was so good of the gentleman to mention the why in all of this because, Mr. Speaker, in 1977, 41 years ago, in the *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, it was ruled constitutional, and now they want to come back 41 years later and say it is not constitutional. That is the big why we are going to get to answer as we move with these great speeches from our Members from across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a tireless fighter for working people, who is also the vice chairman of our Congressional Progressive Caucus as well as the vice chairman of our Democratic National Committee and a good friend. We work together on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker and Members, it is important to understand the big picture here.

When the Supreme Court takes up *Janus*, yes, they are going to be talking about fair share. Is it legal, is it constitutional, for someone to benefit from being represented by a labor union that has to fight for them and then still not have to pay anything to help at all. That will be the question before the Court.

But that is just a very small part of what is really going on. What is really going on, Mr. Speaker, is that we see the deconstruction of the American middle class. The question is: Will America be a land of opportunity; or will it be a land of stagnation where you can work as hard as you want to, but you are never going to be able to make enough to really make it?

What is going on here, Mr. Speaker, is that the conservative movement in our country is trying to break the link between hard work and prosperity as they rifle money and channel it to the very richest among us, and working people just have to hope for the best and work hard just to get back to work for whatever they can scrape together.

Because at the end of the day, labor unions have given workers a voice which has helped create the great American middle class. The lightbulb and the semiconductor are not the great inventions of America. They are great inventions, but the greatest invention of the United States of America is this big, giant middle class which you can work hard and get into.

This is what is under threat. This is what we are fighting to uphold tonight.

Now, *Janus* is a decision that takes place within the context of other decisions. Let us not forget *Shelby County*, a case which attacked our right to vote. Let's not forget *Citizens United*, a case which says corporations are people and they can spend as much money on elections as they choose. Let's not forget these tax cuts passed just about a few weeks ago which rifle money to the richest among us and undermine American workers.

We are in the middle of a battle over whether or not the United States will continue to be a place where hard work pays. That is what this fight is about. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what we invite everyone to understand the union difference. If you are Black, being in a union means you are going to make more money than other folks. If you are a woman, it will mean the same thing. If you are a veteran, it will mean the same thing. Unions have always done more for the people who are in them, and we want to get more people in unions, not fewer.

The attack that we see tonight in the form of this *Janus v. AFSCME* is an attack on that union advantage. But unions have helped everybody, Mr. Speaker. If you look at wage stagnation in America, what you see since World War II, right up until the 1970s, is pay going up and up and up for working people until we see union density begin to break down, and it is at that point that we begin to see wages flat-ten out and stagnate.

Unions create not just good pay and good benefits for their workers, but they actually create benefits for all workers because unions create the wage floor and lift up all boats.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that this is African American History Month only a few days away beginning in February. We must remember people like A. Philip Randolph, who was not only a union leader, he was a civil rights leader. We can't forget about E. D. Nixon, who helped start the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which led to the beginning of the modern American civil rights movement. And let us not forget our beloved Martin Luther King, whose birthday we celebrated a few days ago, and who we will recognize the 50th anniversary of his assassination this year, died fighting for workers of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Workers, who is one of the litigants in this case, the *Janus* case.

So I want to say, if you care about income inequality, if you care about prosperity for working people, you have got to get on the side of fighting against this *Janus* decision. This is what is going on.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ELLISON for his comments. Well done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE). And you talk about a fearless fighter, Mr. Speaker, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership in galvanizing all of us, and I thank my colleagues for very eloquent messages on the floor of the House regarding *Janus v. AFSCME* Council 31.

Let me acknowledge Lee Saunders and the AFSCME family, who have been champions in fighting for the rights of all labor, and that is why we are on the floor of the House today, because we wanted to, in our way as legislators, join in this magnificent fight for constitutional rights of the First Amendment.

And let me take issue with the 1977 Supreme Court case *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education* and turn the Fourth Amendment back to supporting those workers who, in fact, want to associate and participate in unions.

Let me also thank my colleague Chairman Richmond of the Congressional Black Caucus for galvanizing us as well in this effort.

We offered a resolution to honor Echol Cole and Robert Walker. On February 1, 1968, it will be 50 years that these two sanitation workers in Memphis were killed in a horrific accident when the compactor on their sanitation truck malfunctioned. The key is that these individuals had no rights, no benefits. They had no death benefits. They had no protection for their families. They had nothing. And that is why this Supreme Court decision is so crucial and why I hope that the Supreme

Court of the United States will rule in favor of AFSCME against this wrong-headed approach to those who are trying to speak on behalf of those who support the rights of workers.

The Supreme Court cases did the flip of the First Amendment and suggested that the First Amendment of those who disapproved unions was being violated. I believe that the Supreme Court got it completely wrong and that the First Amendment rights of those who move positively to be part of a union could be argued vigorously that their rights are being violated. Not only their rights are being violated, but their rights to have a liveable wage and to work in a safe and protected workforce and workplace. That is what I think the real question is as to why those who want to be in a union must be defeated by the constitutional premise of the First Amendment.

My First Amendment is to join the union and to secure the rights and benefits of those. I hope that the Supreme Court will look to the fact that union members who desire to have fees selected and utilized for the union deducted from their salary have every much a right to the First Amendment. You can opt out, but you should not deny those members the right to the First Amendment to have their voices heard.

In particular, it is important to note the benefits that have come about to the African-American community. And that is the African-American community has seen increasing wages. African-American union workers earn up to \$10,000 or 31 percent more a year than nonunion workers. In 2011, nearly 20 percent of employed African Americans worked for the State, local, or Federal Government compared to 14 percent of other groups. And African Americans are less likely than other groups to work in the private sector.

So let me say this about why I stand here to support the unions and their right to the First Amendment to deduct fees to be able to express their rights. Let me just quickly say as I close: Do you know among the many things that unions have helped us get are weekends, all breaks at work, paid vacations, family medical leave, sick leave, Social Security, minimum wage, civil rights, overtime, child labor laws, and workman's comp?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is an important discussion because so many good elements of saving lives, so much so that those dear sanitation workers would not have lost their life, came about from the sacrifice of unions, and we should provide them with the First Amendment right.

Let me salute Clara Caldwell who will be honored by our union brothers and sisters in Austin, Texas, and let me say the right thing for the Supreme Court to do is rule on behalf of the unions and their rights to the First Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD points about African Americans and

Labor Unions, facts about Janus v. AFSCME Council 31, and 36 reasons to thank the union movement.

AFRICAN AMERICANS AND LABOR UNIONS

1. Historically, the path to the middle class for African Americans was through a union job.

2. African-American workers are more likely to be union members.

3. Unionized workers promote greater income equality and prevent wage discrimination.

4. African American union workers earn up to \$10,000 or 31% more per year than non-union members.

7. Few African Americans are self-employed—only 3.8% reported being self-employed in 2011—making them almost half as likely to be self-employed as Whites (7.2%).

8. Unionized workers are more likely to receive paid leave, more likely to have employer-provided health insurance, and are more likely to be in employer-provided pension plans.

9. Unions play a pivotal role by ensuring workers have continued educational access for their current roles as well as encourage workers to pursue higher education.

10. Nationally, 77 percent of union employees in 2009 were covered by pension plans that provide a guaranteed monthly retirement income. Only 20 percent of non-union workers are covered by guaranteed (defined-benefit) pensions 20%.

11. Union workers are 53.9% more likely to have employer-provided pensions.

12. When unions are strong and able to represent the people who want to join them, these gains spread throughout the economy and the overall community.

13. Workers who form unions are able to boost wages, which helps attract and retain staff.

14. When non-union companies increase their wages, it gives all workers more purchasing power.

15. Communities with a strong middle class have sufficient tax revenues to support schools, hospitals and roads.

16. Historically, pensions, social security and personal savings ensured that workers could retire with dignity.

17. With the current recession and the attack on pensions, many workers are left to depend on social security and their personal savings alone.

18. Many African American elders find themselves in a precarious situation after decades of work.

19. Union members played a critical role in the civil rights struggles of the past and that involvement continues today.

20. When Martin Luther King Jr. was jailed for civil disobedience, unions and union members frequently came to his aid with the legal and financial help he needed.

21. Philip Randolph and Bayard Rustin both union leaders help to organize the March on Washington in 1963 and in countless cities around the country.

22. Martin Luther King Jr. was shot and killed while in Memphis to aid striking sanitation workers.

23. Today, labor unions are still on the forefront of efforts to ensure that the gains of the past are maintained and to fight for those still denied opportunity and equality.

FACTS ABOUT JANUS V. AFSCME COUNCIL 31—
SOURCE: AFSCME

Facts of the Case

In 1977, the Supreme Court, in *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, upheld against a First Amendment challenge a Michigan law that allowed a public employer whose employees were represented by a union to require those of its employees who did not join

the union nevertheless to pay fees to it because they benefited from the union's collective bargaining agreement with the employer.

Illinois has a law similar to that upheld in Michigan. The governor of Illinois brought a lawsuit challenging the law on the ground that the statute violates the First Amendment by compelling employees who disapprove of the union to contribute money to it. The district court dismissed the complaint on the grounds that the governor lacked standing to sue because he did not stand to suffer injury from the law, but two public employees intervened in the action to seek that *Abood* be overturned. Given that *Abood* is binding on lower courts, the district court dismissed the claim, and the Seventh Circuit affirmed dismissal for the same reason.

Legal Question Presented:

Should the Court's decision in *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education* should be overturned so that public employees who do not belong to a union cannot be required to pay a fee to cover the union's costs to negotiate a contract that applies to all public employees, including those who are not union members?

Janus v. AFSCME Council 31 threatens our union and all working families. This case, which will come before the Supreme Court in February, represents a huge threat to our union. As a local leader, you are critical to how we defend and protect our union, our members and public services in the face of this threat.

This lawsuit aims to take away the freedom of working people to join together in strong unions to speak up for themselves and their communities. In February, the U.S. Supreme Court will hear the case and a decision is expected by the summer.

What are fair share fees, and why are they important?

Unions work because we all pay our fair share and we all benefit from what we negotiate together. Fair share fees provide public service workers with the power in numbers they need to negotiate better wages, benefits and protections that improve work conditions and set standards for everyone.

Each public service worker chooses whether or not to join a union, but the union is still required by law to represent and negotiate on behalf of all public service workers—members and non-members alike. All employees receive the wage increases, benefits and workplace rights negotiated through the union.

The corporate special interests behind this case want to take away our ability to build strength in numbers. That is why they want the Supreme Court to rule that workers can receive all the benefits of a union contract without contributing anything in return. All workers should chip in their fair share to cover the cost of representing them.

Is anyone ever forced to join a union or pay for politics?

No. The simple truth is that no one is forced to join a union and no one is forced to pay any fees that go to politics or political candidates. That is already the law of the land. Nothing in this case will change that. This case is about taking away the freedom of working people to join together, speak up for each other and build a better life for themselves and their families by undermining their ability to form strong unions.

What is the real impact of this case?

When working people have the freedom and opportunity to speak up together through unions, we make progress together that benefits everyone. The wealthy elite behind this case are trying to use the highest court in the land to take away our freedom to create the power in numbers to secure better lives

for ourselves, our families, our communities and our country by undermining our ability to form strong unions.

If fair share fees are struck down, employees who benefit from the gains that the union makes will not have to pay anything toward the cost of that representation. If the billionaires and corporate CEOs behind this case get their way, they will take away the freedom of working people to come together and build power to fight for the things our families and communities need: everything from affordable health care and retirement security to quicker medical emergency response times.

What is this case really about?

The case aims to erode the freedom to form unions to improve our lives and the communities we serve. Real freedom is about making a decent living from our hard work; it's also about having time to take a loved one to the doctor, attend a parent-teacher conference and retire in dignity. The corporate special interests behind this case do not believe that working people should have the freedom to negotiate a fair return on their work.

Who is behind this case?

The National Right to Work Foundation is part of a network funded by corporate billionaires to use the courts to rig the rules against working people. For decades, these wealthy elites have used their massive fortunes to gain outsized influence to chip away at the progress unions have won for all working families. Now they want the highest court in the land to take away our freedom to come together to protect what our communities need: a living wage, retirement security, health benefits, the ability to care for loved ones and more.

How do unions benefit our communities?

People in unions continue to win rights, benefits and protections for all working people and their communities. When public service workers belong to strong unions, they fight for staffing levels, equipment and training that saves lives and improves the public services our communities rely upon. And when union membership is high, entire communities enjoy higher wages.

36 REASONS TO THANK THE UNION MOVEMENT

1. Weekends
2. All breaks at work, including your lunch breaks
3. Paid vacation
4. FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act)
5. Sick leave
6. Social security
7. Minimum wage
8. Civil Rights Act Title VII (prohibits Employer Discrimination)
9. 8-Hour work day
10. Overtime pay
11. Child labor laws
12. Occupational Safety & Health Act (OSHA)
13. 40 Hour Work Week
14. Worker's Compensation (Worker's Camp)
15. Unemployment Insurance
16. Pensions
17. Workplace Safety Standards and Regulations
18. Employer Health Care Insurance
19. Collective Bargaining Rights for Employees
20. Wrongful Termination Laws
21. Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967
22. Whistleblower Protection Laws
23. Employee Polygraph Protect Act (Prohibits Employer from using a lie detector test on an employee)
24. Veteran's Employment and Training Services (VETS)
25. Compensation increases and Evaluations (Raises)

26. Sexual Harassment laws
27. Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA)
28. Holiday Pay
29. Employer Dental, Life, and Vision Insurance
30. Privacy Rights
31. Pregnancy and Parental Leave
32. Military Leave
33. The Right to Strike
34. Public Education for Children
35. Equal Pay Acts of 1963 & 2011
36. (Requires employers pay men and women equally for the same amount of work)
37. Laws Ending Sweatshops in the United States

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Congressman from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who is a strong fighter on behalf of unions.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Congressman SCOTT for hosting tonight's Special Order hour and his continual dedication to making sure that working families are represented by his great leadership.

Tonight, the Janus-Council 31 case and the value of unions is what we are here to speak about. As we hold this Special Order hour, there are efforts across the country working to trample workers' rights. The Supreme Court case, Janus v. AFSCME, aims to take away the freedom and the opportunity for working people to join together and strong unions to speak up for them, their families, and their communities.

□ 2100

Any effort that threatens to undermine public sector collective bargaining rights is an attack on working people and their ability to negotiate with a strong voice in their workplace. We must be unwavering in our support of workers' rights.

Over the decades, unions were vital in our communities, particularly for women and communities of color. African-American women in unions earn an average of \$21.90 an hour, while non-union women earn \$17.04 an hour. In addition, more than 72 percent of women in unions have health insurance, while less than 50 percent of nonunion African-American women do. The important work that unions do every day is improving our economy and the lives of countless working families in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I had much more to say, but in the interest of time, I will say I know how important it is to be represented. I, in my working career, have been in two labor unions myself, and I worked at a company and was fired. My uncle fired me. My father was the hearing officer against me, and my grandfather was the witness against me. Mr. Speaker, I know how important it is to be represented because the union got my job back.

Thank you, Congressman SCOTT, for hosting tonight's Special Order Hour on the Janus case, Council 31, and the Value of Unions.

As we hold this special order hour, there are efforts across the country working to trample workers' rights.

The Supreme Court case, Janus v. AFSCME, aims to take away the freedom and opportunity for working people to join together in strong unions to speak up for themselves, their families and their communities.

Any effort that threatens to undermine public sectors collective bargaining rights is an attack on working people and their ability to negotiate with a strong voice in their workplace. We must be unwavering in our support of workers' rights.

Over the decades, unions were vital in our communities, particularly for women and communities of color. African-American women in unions earn an average of \$21.90 an hour while nonunion women earn \$17.04. In addition, more than 72 percent of women in unions have health insurance, while less than 50 percent of nonunion African-American women do.

The important work that unions do every day is improving our economy and the lives of countless working families across this country.

For example, in New Jersey, unions are helping train the next generation of health care professionals. To address New Jersey's nursing shortage, the AFSCME Local 1199J developed a system for union members to develop and maintain the skills needed for career advancement in nursing.

The union also supports programs like the Youth Transitions to Work Certified Nursing Apprenticeship, which helps prepare Newark-area high school juniors and seniors as they start a career in nursing.

As you can see, unions and strong union membership fill the gaps when others drop the ball. Janus is the culmination of decades of attacks on working people by corporations, the wealthiest one percent, and hostile politicians. This right-wing attack against the middle class must not stand.

The forces behind this case are the same forces that have pushed for limiting voting rights, attacked immigrants, and undermined civil rights protections.

In fact, this is the third instance where the Trump Solicitor General's office is reversing that office's position, seriously jeopardizing the Department of Justice's reputation before the court and undermining the rule of law.

It is undeniable that unions have played a critical role in building and protecting the middle class in America.

Unions provide hard working people economic stability and give them the tools to build a good life, home, and education for themselves and their children. We must stand together to ensure that America has strong labor protections that work for everyone.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I really appreciate that.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), who is a leader on the Judiciary Committee and who knows full well how wrong it would be for the Supreme Court to reverse itself and take away a right that was given to labor unions just 41 years ago and then switch it back. That is not fair.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on this issue.

Here in America, if you work hard and play by the rules, you should be able to provide a comfortable living for yourself and for your family; but for

far too many American workers, that basic contract has been broken.

Since the early 1970s, the productivity of the American worker has increased in excess of 285 percent; but during that same period of time, wages have increased by less than 10 percent. So the productivity gains of the American worker have not gone to the American worker; instead, they have gone to the privileged few, to millionaires and billionaires and to big corporations to subsidize the lifestyles of the rich and shameless. That is the America that we are dealing with right now.

Some may explain it as a result of globalization; some may say it is fully negotiated trade deals; some may say it is the outsourcing of good-paying American jobs; some may say it is the rise of automation. Certainly, all of those factors are implicated, but the decline in unionization has been a significant, if not decisive, reason that so many people have been struggling to achieve the American Dream.

And now the Supremes, in their wisdom, want to give us another raw deal, rightwing hit to benefit the wealthy and the well-off to the detriment of hardworking Americans. So let's hope that Justice Kennedy does the right thing, that five Justices on the Supreme Court see themselves to not interfere and overturn settled law for the purpose of continuing a march to benefit the privileged few to the detriment of hardworking Americans.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman so much for his comments.

It is with great pleasure that I yield to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER), who also served as the former secretary of labor of Delaware, whom I have worked with on our Agriculture Committee.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the opportunity to speak at this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, as the former secretary of labor and head of personnel for the State of Delaware, I am here this evening on the floor of the House to lend my voice in support of the thousands of men and women across the country who are dedicated public servants who currently belong to public sector labor unions; who teach our children, pave our roads, protect us, care for our seniors; who don't receive huge salaries; who don't work in palatial offices; and whose very right to organize and collectively bargain is under attack.

At the end of February, the Supreme Court is set to hear a case, *Janus v. AFSCME Council 31*, which is simply another attempt to weaken the rights of public sector employees in the fight for better pay, paid sick leave, and the ability to one day retire with dignity.

Mr. Speaker, the plaintiff in this case seeks to bar the ability for public sector unions from collecting fair share fees. Fair share fees are collected from

public sector employees to help their unions negotiate for better wages, benefits, and protections.

It is important to note that no union can be effective at negotiating with employers unless the employees who reap the benefits of these negotiations pay for the collective bargaining—even if they are not members of the union.

The Supreme Court has already ensured that a union's political activities and their collective bargaining activities are separate from their fair share dues. No public sector worker is being asked to contribute funds to causes to which they do not agree. It should be noted that unions go through painstaking detail to ensure that no funds are misused.

When our first responders, teachers, and public sector workers come together and form strong unions, they win benefits, like better working conditions, better wages, healthcare, and retirement security, which also benefit nonunion members.

As our economy shifts and the wealth gap grows, the protective power of unions must be strengthened, not weakened. Without the freedom to come together, working people would not have the power in numbers they need to make our communities and our country more prosperous.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Justices will see the value, need, and success of public sector collective bargaining and that everyone must pay their fair share.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is very important to recognize that Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE is a senior member of the Judiciary Committee as well and has vowed to lead this fight in the committee, and we appreciate that.

It gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from Orlando, Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS). And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that Mrs. DEMINGS is the former chief of police of Orlando. Who better to speak to the damage that this Supreme Court Janus decision could have on our police officers than the former chief of police.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) for his leadership on this very critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, America is a great nation, and tonight we continue to celebrate that fact. But we do know that great things don't just happen on their own. If we take a serious look through the pages of history, we will see the blood, the sweat, and the tears of many people. Some of those people came on cruise ships, and some came on slave ships. But regardless of the foundation on which our journey in America began, many were there helping to build what we now know as a great nation.

Mr. Speaker, the American worker is intertwined in the moral fabric of our great society. As America began to grow as an industrialized society, so did its workforce and the need to de-

velop fair and equitable workplace standards.

I joined the Orlando Police Department in 1984, and on my first day of orientation, I joined the union. I joined a great department, and I wanted to do my part to keep it a great department. I proudly joined the union, and I clearly understood—and it appeared at that time that those in management also understood—that the union was working hard to ensure that employees, both sworn and civilian, worked in a safe work environment, were paid fair wages, and were fairly compensated in the event of death on the job.

I was an active member of the union, and when I moved to the management ranks, I met regularly with union leadership to ensure we continued to have a healthy work environment, fair wages, meaningful benefits, and safe working conditions. That has been and continues to be the work of American unions.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a strong fighter for labor unions.

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, his name was Victor, although he went by Vic. He was the oldest of six on their very hard scrabble farm in rural South Dakota.

One day, he came home from school, when he was just in the eighth grade, and he was met at the porch by his father, who told him, in his broken English, that he would have to quit school to save the family farm, denying him the education that he wanted so very badly because, you see, it was the winter of 1930 and the Great Depression had arrived.

He lived a life of deprivation before and after, kicking around from job to job just to survive, just to keep from starving. World War II came. He volunteered, and afterwards, he became a truck driver and a teamster.

The woman he would marry, Jean, had a high school education, no college. She became a telephone operator and a member of Communications Workers of America.

Together, they worked very hard and they raised four children. They owned their own home. They had a wooden boat in the garage. They took annual modest vacations. They had healthcare coverage, and they helped each of their children attend college who wanted to. Then they had a secure retirement, and they owed it all to the strength of their unions.

Mr. Speaker, one of their four children stands before you today. Thank you, Teamsters. Thank you, Communications Workers of America. Thank you, unions across America.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressional Black Caucus for holding this important discussion.

For the past 4 years, courts have held that public sector unions can charge a

small fee to workers that benefit from the collective bargaining agreements that unions negotiate and enforce. Reversing that precedent is not an honest shift in legal interpretation. It is a political attack against American workers and the organizations that represent them, and it has been years in the making.

For decades, a relentless, coordinated campaign supported by large corporate interests, advanced by political partisans, and funded by the Koch brothers has tried to rebrand union membership as a burden on American workers. Their campaign is as cynical as it is misleading.

For nearly a year, the United States Senate refused to give the highly respected Judge Merrick Garland even one hearing, then overruled at least 100 years of Senate tradition to steal a seat on the Supreme Court.

That seat is now the difference between a Court that upholds the rights of public sector unions and one that undermines their existence. Today, President Trump, the real estate billionaire who promised to be a voice for American workers, has pursued the most aggressive antiworker agenda in recent memory.

Thank you to my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for holding this important discussion.

This evening I am speaking—not just as a strong supporter of public sector unions—but as a former union member myself. Throughout my 24 years in the classroom, I was a proud, dues-paying member of the California Teachers Association.

And here's why: Union membership means higher pay, better training, and safer working conditions. It means access to paid sick leave if you or a loved one gets sick. It means medical benefits, life insurance, and retirement security for families in communities across the country. It means a compassionate, humane workplace. And it means greater opportunities and a better future for the children of union workers.

At a time when income inequality is high, middle-class wages are stagnant, and workers' benefits are rapidly disappearing, collective bargaining is the last remaining source of leverage for American workers.

And now the conservatives on the Supreme Court are preparing to strip that leverage away.

For the past 40 years, Courts have held that public sector unions can charge a small fee to workers that benefit from the collective bargaining agreements that unions negotiate and enforce. Reversing that precedent is not an honest shift in legal interpretation. It is a political attack against American workers and the organizations that represent them . . . and it has been years in the making.

For decades, a relentless, coordinated campaign, supported by large corporate interests, advanced by political partisans, and funded by the Koch Brothers, has tried to rebrand union membership as a burden on American workers.

Their campaign is as cynical as it is misleading.

For nearly a year, the United States Senate refused to give the highly respected Judge

Merrick Garland even one hearing, and then overruled at least 100 years of Senate tradition to steal a seat on the Supreme Court.

That seat is now the difference between a Court that upholds the rights of public sector unions and one that undermines their existence.

And today, President Trump—the real estate billionaire who promised to be a voice for American workers has pursued the most aggressive anti-worker agenda in recent memory.

In the White House, in Congress, and now in the Supreme Court, American workers are being deprived of the protections that built the middle class. And instead of accepting blame for exacerbating the challenges facing working families, Republicans are pointing the finger at immigrants and refugees in an attempt to divide and distract our nation from the true source of inequality.

The decision in *Janus v. AFSCME* must be the beginning of a new effort, supported by all my colleagues here this evening, to restore the respect and benefits that American workers deserve.

□ 2115

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. SCOTT and the Congressional Black Caucus for this Special Order.

The *Janus* case is critically important to public employees, but, more importantly, to all the people who rely on public services that they provide.

This is an Illinois case—it is my State—*Janus v. AFSCME* Council 31, a relentless fighter for American workers. Before becoming Governor, Bruce Rauner was chairman of a private equity firm where he put profits ahead of working families. As Governor, he was the one who filed this suit.

We need to make sure that we protect workers all over this country. We need to win this case before the Supreme Court. Justice calls for winning for union members.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. PERLMUTTER may have 4 minutes as our final speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). The Chair cannot entertain the gentleman's request. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I had so many Members that I couldn't get them all in. But I appreciate it, and I hope that I have shared with the American people tonight this case and the threat it holds for our very valuable unions.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pledge my whole-hearted support for the right of workers to organize and to decry the efforts of powerful corporate interests to outlaw public sector union fair share fees in the *Janus v. AFSCME* case currently before the Supreme Court.

Today, despite being more productive than ever, American workers are working longer hours for less money and fewer benefits.

It is no accident that working people are struggling. Corporate CEOs continue to use their wealth to influence politicians to rig the economic rules to benefit the wealthy and powerful at the expense of everyone else.

Now, those same corporate CEOs and special interests are behind a Supreme Court case called *Janus v. AFSCME*—a case that threatens to make things even worse for working people.

This case aims to take away the opportunity for working people to join together in strong unions to speak up for themselves, their families, and their communities.

When teachers, nurses, police officers, firefighters, and other public service workers are free to build strong unions, they win benefits like better working conditions, better wages, health care, clean and safe environments, and retirement security that benefit not just union members, but all workers.

Given that all workers benefit, it has been standard practice that all workers contribute their fair share of the cost of organizing—a practice upheld unanimously by the Supreme Court in 1977.

But the CEOs and corporate special interests behind the *Janus* case have abandoned the conservative principle of respect for precedent.

They are instead driven by a misguided belief that working people should be denied the same ability as they have to effectively negotiate a fair return on their work so that they can provide for themselves and their families.

The *Janus* case is a blatantly political and well-funded plot to use the highest court in the land to further rig the economic rules against everyday working people.

But what these corporate bigwigs fail to recognize is that unions are now more important than ever.

Unions work because we all pay our fair share and we all benefit from what we negotiate together.

The forces behind this case know that by joining together in strong unions, working people are able to win the power and voice they need to level the economic and political playing field.

That is why I will continue to stand with American workers and their unions to ensure that they are protected, and that they are able to pursue their own version of the American dream.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and ask that we act now to preserve and defend labor unions.

Unions have played a critical role in building and protecting the middle class in America. They provide hard working people economic stability for their families and give them the tools to build a good life, home and education for themselves and their children.

As early as this week, the Supreme Court could take up *Janus v. AFSCME* which aims to take away the ability of working people to join together in strong unions.

Janus v. AFSCME would gut the entire public sector "right-to-work" in one fell swoop.

Janus is the culmination of decades of attacks on working people by corporate CEOs, the wealthiest 1%. The forces behind this case are the same forces that have pushed for limiting voting rights, attacked immigrants, and undermined civil rights protections.

When working people have the freedom and opportunity to speak up together through

unions, we make progress together that benefits everyone.

If the billionaires and corporate CEOs behind this case get their way, however, they will take away the freedom of working people to come together and build power to fight for the things our communities need: everything from affordable health care and retirement security to quicker medical emergency response times.

With Janus, CEOs and billionaires want to use the highest court in the land to take away our freedom to create the power in numbers to win better lives for ourselves, our families, our communities and our country.

Labor unions date back to the 18th century. They were established to help workers with work related issues such as low pay, unsafe working conditions, and long hours to have a body of individuals to speak on their behalf.

Labor unions are a brilliant balance of power between employees and employers. They have gained the power to negotiate peacefully for adequate treatment and respect as the economic backbone of this country.

Some of the accomplishments include increasing wages, raising the standard of living for the working class, ensuring safe and sanitary working conditions, and increased benefits for both workers and their families.

The group mentality of unions provides the comfort of inclusion and recognition that employees seek in the workplace. When an employee sees his or her needs are important and being met, then the quality of his or her work life increases tremendously.

As the working class continues to push the economy forward, unions are becoming more and more necessary.

Unions are the spokespersons for the overworked—and sometimes the underappreciated.

Unions assure that every employee has a seat at the table. Some business employers may argue that unionized workers create an atmosphere that lessens the sense of partnership with their supervisors.

No one is forced to join a union. Membership is purely optional.

We must preserve the right of employees to join together to negotiate for better pay and working conditions.

Strong unions also advocate for equal opportunity for women and communities of color who have been discriminated against.

Union jobs have historically been and continue to be a path to the middle class for people of color, who often face low wages in their professions. African-American union members today earn 14.7 percent more—and Latino union workers 21.8 percent more—than their nonunion counterparts.

As representatives of these great states, we owe it to our middle class to not silence their voice. They deserve their fair share of the economic prosperity that they have helped to create.

Unions are and always will be an important factor in making the economy work for all Americans.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, in the years following the Great Recession (2009–2012), 91 percent of all new wealth created accrued to the top one percent of earners.

From 1980 through 2014, incomes for the wealthiest one percent of Americans rose by 204 percent while incomes for the bottom 50 percent rose by just 1 percent.

During that period, the size and productivity of the U.S. economy have essentially doubled.

President Trump likes to tout a booming stock market, but the wealthiest 20 percent of Americans own 92% of the stocks. The other 80 percent, four out of five Americans, own just 8 percent of that wealth and are being largely left behind.

And things are about to get much worse, because the Trump tax scam does exactly the same thing that has failed us for decades: trickle-down economics. It failed under Reagan, it failed again under Bush. Every time Republicans ram it through, it adds billions, in Trump's case trillions of dollars to our debt, and the wealthy walk away with the benefits. The rich get richer and the rest of us just have to work harder for less.

Meanwhile just in the past six weeks, Sam's Club laid off some 11,000 employees. Carrier cut another 1,500. AT&T laid off some 4,000. Kimberly Clark, the company that makes Kleenex and Huggies, just announced that it would use Trump's tax scam as an opportunity to lay off 5,000 or more workers and close 10 manufacturing facilities.

Janus v. AFSCME is an effort by the wealthy and powerful to further insulate their economic power and ability to restrict access to wealth for the rest of us.

Strong unions are key to unrigging this economy, improving local communities and the lives of union and nonunion families alike.

Unions are associated with greater productivity, lower employee turnover, improved workplace communication, and a better-trained workforce.

Data shows that unions and unionization lead to increased economic growth and competitiveness.

According to the BLS, among full-time and salary workers, in 2017 union members had average weekly earnings of \$1,041, non-union members had median weekly earnings of \$829.

When union membership is high, entire communities enjoy wages that represent a fair return for their work and greater social and economic stability and mobility. And unions advocate for policies that benefit all working people, e.g. minimum wage, affordable health care, and quality public schools.

Unions provide a path to the middle class for working people by increasing their income and the economic security of their families.

As union membership has decreased because of attacks on working people, income inequality has risen in the U.S. Source.

Through collective bargaining, members of strong unions are scoring victories that help entire communities—like safer nurse-staffing levels that help patients and smaller classroom sizes that help students.

AFSCME Region President, Ron Briggs, suggested you may recognize the following members because they have worked diligently to sign agency fee payers in their locals/units and are active in fighting back against the Janus case, right-to-work and the pro-corporate agenda:

Lorraine Aumic from Local 688 Office of Temporary & Disability Assistance. She lives in Schenectady.

Bryan Schaeffer from Local 886 Schenectady School Districts, Municipalities, and Towns. He lives in Delanson.

Michele Kuiber from Local 671 Workers Compensation Board. She lives in Amsterdam.

Jodi Aubin from Local 655 Environmental Conservation. She lives in Clifton Park.

Janus v. AFSCME is the product of a political scheme to further tilt economic power away from working people and the middle class. It strikes at the freedom of working people to come together in strong unions.

Unions are critical to America's middle class, providing economic stability, a good life, home and education for workers and their families.

CEOs and corporate special interests behind this case oppose letting workers negotiate a fair wage for their work.

The case was brought to manipulate the Supreme Court to satisfy blatantly political goals. In a 10-page State Policy Network (SPN) fundraising letter reported on in The Guardian, SPN President and CEO Tracie Sharp wrote that the goal of their Koch-backed network's \$80 million campaign was to "defund and defang" unions.

The original plaintiff in this case was Illinois Gov. Bruce Rauner, who launched a political attack on public employees after taking office. A U.S. District Court judge ruled in 2015 that Rauner had "no standing" to bring suit, so the legal arms of the National Right to Work Committee and the Liberty Justice Center went looking for plaintiffs to serve as stand-ins for Rauner in the federal lawsuit.

The Supreme Court case Janus v. AFSCME, Council 31 aims to take away the freedom of—and opportunity for—working people to join together in strong unions to speak up for themselves, their families and their communities. When teachers, nurses, police officers, firefighters and other public service workers are free to come together in strong unions, they win benefits like better working conditions, better wages, health care, clean and safe environments and retirement security that benefit non-union members as well. But the CEOs and corporate special interests behind this case simply do not believe that working people should have the same freedoms and opportunities as they do: to negotiate a fair return on our work so that we can provide for ourselves and our families. They are funding this case through the National Right to Work Foundation, because they view strong unions as a threat to their power and greed.

When working people have the freedom and opportunity to speak up together through unions, we make progress together that benefits everyone. If the billionaires and corporate CEOs behind this case get their way, however, they will take away the freedom of working people to come together and build power to fight for the things our communities need: everything from affordable health care and retirement security to quicker medical emergency response times. The CEOs and billionaires want to use the highest court in the land to take away our freedom to create the power in numbers to win better lives for ourselves, our families, our communities and our country.

People in unions continue to win rights, benefits and protections not only for union members, but for all working people and their communities in and outside of the workplace. When nurses, firefighters, 911 dispatchers and EMS workers belong to strong unions, they fight for staffing levels, equipment and training that save lives. And when union membership is high, entire communities enjoy wages that represent a fair return on their work and greater social and economic mobility. Without the freedom to come together, working people

would not have the power in numbers they need to make our communities safer, stronger and more prosperous.

The National Right to Work Foundation is part of a network funded by corporate billionaires to use the courts to rig the rules against everyday working people. For decades, the corporate CEOs and billionaires funding this case have used their massive fortunes to pay politicians and corporate lobbyists to chip away at the freedoms people in unions have won for every single one of us. Now they want the highest court in the land to take away our freedom to come together to protect things our families need: a living wage, retirement security, health benefits, the ability to care for loved ones and more.

This case originated from a political scheme by billionaire Bruce Rauner, governor of Illinois, to advance an agenda benefiting corporations and the wealthy. Rauner launched a political attack on public service workers immediately after taking office, filing a lawsuit on his own behalf to bar the collection of fair share fees by public service unions. A federal judge ruled that Rauner could not bring this action because he was not himself an employee paying fair share fees. But the legal arms of the National Right to Work Committee and the Liberty Justice Center were able to carry the case forward by finding plaintiffs as stand-ins for Rauner in the federal lawsuit. The district court dismissed the case, based on long-standing precedent. The plaintiffs asked the lower court to fast-track their appeal and rule against them in order to more quickly get the case before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Unions work because we all pay our fair share and we all benefit from what we negotiate together. Fair share fees provide public service workers with the power in numbers they need to negotiate better wages, benefits and protections that improve work conditions and set standards for everyone. Each individual public service worker chooses whether or not to join a union, but the union is still required by law to represent and negotiate on behalf of all public service workers—members and nonmembers alike. The corporate special interests behind this case want to take away the freedom of public service workers to have the power in numbers to provide for their families and make their communities stronger. That is why they want the Supreme Court to rule that workers can receive all the benefits of a union contract without contributing anything in return. Look at it this way: If you go out to dinner with a group of friends, you still pay your fair share of the check even if you didn't get to choose the restaurant.

No one is forced to join a union and no one is forced to pay any fees that go to politics or political candidates. That is already the law of the land. Nothing in this case will change that. This case is about taking away the freedom of working people to come together, speak up for each other and build a better life for themselves and their families.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in calling attention to an attack on one of our most basic fundamental rights as American citizens—the right to organize in our workplace.

The impending Supreme Court case, *Janus v. AFSCME*, is nothing more than a continued attack by corporate CEOs on American workers' right to unite and advocate for fair labor standards. This critical right offers working

people the opportunity to get ahead through bargaining with their employers for better wages, benefits, and working conditions.

Wherever you work, if you appreciate a 40 hour work week, sick leave and vacation days, guaranteed safe working conditions, then you have unions to thank. And the outcome of this Supreme Court case will impact you. It was not a benevolent employer who brought fair labor standards to the American workforce; it was American workers. And an attack on the ability to organize in the workplace is an attack on all of them.

Since the inception of labor unions, American workers—both unionized and non-unionized—have enjoyed substantial gains in wages, safety, and stability. In fact, throughout the 20th Century, the growth of unions gave rise to the creation of the great American middle-class, who has contributed immensely to our great nation. Over the years, however, a change in global economy, unfair trade agreements, and a deliberate effort to weaken unions have made life much harder for the middle class. In fact, for far too many middle-class families, the American dream has sadly now become nothing more than a memory of time passed.

This decimation of the middle class coincides with the Majority's relentless attacks on labor unions. The Majority has pushed right-to-work legislation, tried to weaken enforcement of workers' collective rights, and has even tried to repeal prevailing wage laws. They are working hand-in-glove with the Trump administration, which supports a national right-to-work bill. We are seeing many dangerous attacks on the state level, too.

I continue to fight against these attacks on our workers. All the while, I will also keep fighting to overhaul NAFTA, which has caused my district to lose half of its manufacturing jobs. In holding our trading partners to a higher standard, it is critical that we practice what we preach. That means promoting strong labor standards here at home and protecting American workers against unyielding efforts to weaken their right to organize.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, *Janus v. AFSCME* comes down to a binary choice: will the U.S. stand up for the fundamental right of workers to form a union and collectively bargain; or will the Supreme Court allow large corporations to continue their assault on hard-working Americans.

Unions are a vital part of our nation. Decades ago, Congress protected the right of workers to join together and bargain for better wages, regular work hours and improved safety conditions, giving workers a voice when negotiating with large corporations.

Despite their role in creating and maintaining America's working middle class, unions are under relentless attack.

It is no coincidence that a dramatic rise in income inequality coincides with a nation-wide campaign against unionization.

American workers have become more productive, yet wages have stagnated. Their hard work has created billions of dollars in profits, all while working longer hours for less pay and fewer benefits.

Endless attacks have been launched against workers' overtime pay, retirement savings, and health care.

The tax code was just tilted even more toward the wealthiest individuals and corporations.

Corporate profits were at all-time highs before the tax cut.

Unions ensure workers can fight for their fair share of the profits they help create.

On average, unionized workers earn \$207 more per week than non-unionized workers. Unionized workers have greater access to paid holidays, paid sick leave, life insurance, medical, and retirement benefits.

Unionized workforces lead to less turnover for employers and more highly skilled workers. Children of union members are more likely to climb the ladder to the middle class. States with higher union density have better workplace laws.

The foundation of U.S. labor law has held firm for nearly 70 years. American standards are what we strive to hold other countries to when negotiating trade deals, yet these standards are constantly under attack.

The Supreme Court will soon hear oral arguments in *Janus v. AFSCME*, a case that could fundamentally end collective bargaining.

The question of "fair share" was settled by the Supreme Court years ago. Unions are required by law to represent and negotiate on behalf of all public sector employees, regardless of whether or not a worker decides to formally join the union.

Fair share fees support that requirement and ensure no worker is required to join the union and no one is forced to pay any fees that go toward politics or candidates they disagree with. But all employees benefit from union negotiations. It is only fair that all employees contribute.

This is already the law. *Janus* is just another in a long line of attacks on unions and workers.

Since Republicans took control of the House in 2011, they have convened more than 30 hearings and markups to undermine workers' rights in the Education and the Workforce Committee alone.

Rather than attacking workers' rights, we should focus on raising wages and improving working conditions for all Americans. We should work to ensure paid family, sick and medical leave, improve access to child care, and ensure access to quality, affordable health care for all Americans.

It's time for my colleagues to turn their words into actions. It's time to support unions and the American worker. The real middle class.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, labor unions have played a crucial role in the formation of United States. Since 1869, unions have provided a platform for workers to collectively bargain for better wages, better hours, and safer working conditions. Every single worker living in the United States today has benefitted in some way from the role of unions, helping to shape our nation into the country that we all know and admire.

Today, unions play a more important role than ever before in recent history, particularly for the most vulnerable segments of our population, such as women and communities of color. When unions are strong, communities are stronger. Yet now, as union membership declines, so have opportunities for working and middle class families. In 2016, there were 14.6 million unionized members in the United States, down from 17.7 million in 1983. Union membership in the private sector has fallen to below seven percent. Wages have also remained stagnant since the 1970s, while people continue to work longer hours and often

times multiple jobs just to make ends meet. These consequences can be traced back to deliberate attacks against workers' rights and their ability to organize.

The Supreme Court case in *Janus v. AFSCME*, Council 31, is a clear manifestation of these attacks on collective bargaining rights. The U.S. Supreme Court will hear oral arguments on this case on February 26, 2018, which will question the future of "fair share fees"—or fees requiring non-union members to help cover the costs of a union's collective bargaining activities—in the context of our First Amendment rights. The Supreme Court has the potential to upend more than 40 years of unanimous precedent supporting a states' ability to determine its own labor policy. It is truly another important milestone in our nation's history which will define who we are for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, as wages remain stagnant and more workers fail to find gainful employment, we need to question the direction in which our country is headed. Do we want all bargaining power to be concentrated in the hands of only the wealthiest corporations? Or do we believe that American workers should retain reasonable means to organize when wages, benefits, and working conditions decline? I believe in the latter. I believe in the American people. This Congress must do more to protect the collective bargaining rights of working families, not only because it is the right thing to do but because our nation is stronger when we do so.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE FBI STEPS DOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 22 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. GOHMERT, my classmate, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow night the President will come before this Chamber to address Americans and the wider world. While some in this Chamber and those watching at home will disagree with the President's vision, I hope that we may all agree to pay attention to the facts.

The fact remains that our economy is booming. Thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, middle class Americans are receiving bonuses and are empowered to keep more of their paychecks. Energy companies are slashing their rates so that taxpayers are spending less on energy. Families are now able to keep more of their hard-earned money to spend any way they wish.

The Dow Jones has soared into new heights under this administration. These facts will surely be addressed by the President, even if they are conveniently ignored by some in this Chamber and members of the news media.

I look forward to attending the State of the Union and encourage all those tuning in to remember the facts.

Mr. GOHMERT. My friend, former President FOXX, collegiate president

and great Member of the House, made some great points. I look forward to hearing the President's State of the Union Address tomorrow as well.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal going on here lately in Washington, and something that has been a real threat to what I believe is the greatest law enforcement institution in the history of mankind, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich has pointed out a number of times, had candidate Hillary Clinton won the Presidency in November of 2016, we would have no idea how badly or how significantly the Department of Justice and the FBI had been weaponized politically. I just thank God we had the opportunity to find out before it was too late and to do something about it.

Today's news has been that, as *The Wall Street Journal* article by Aruna Viswanatha and Del Quentin Wilber today reported: FBI deputy chief steps down after Trump criticism.

The article points out: "Deputy FBI Director Andrew McCabe left his post on Monday after his bosses urged him to step aside, said people familiar with the matter, following weeks of criticism from President Donald Trump and other Republicans."

I guess I would be one of those other Republicans.

"Mr. McCabe will take leftover vacation time until he is technically eligible to retire from the Federal Bureau of Investigation in March, the people said."

"Mr. McCabe has faced a steady string of attacks over an alleged conflict of interest stemming from his wife's previous run for Virginia State Senate as a Democrat before he became deputy director. He has denied any conflict."

"But Mr. Trump and other Republicans have cited it as part of a broader assertion of bias on the part of the FBI, Justice Department, and special counsel's office as they investigate Russian meddling in the 2016 campaign and any links between the Trump campaign and Moscow in that effort. Mr. Trump has specifically called for Mr. McCabe's ouster."

"Democrats say these assertions are an attempt to distract from the investigations and discredit them."

"FBI Director Chris Wray, addressing Mr. McCabe's departure in an email to employees, said Mr. Wray 'will not be swayed by political or other pressure' in making decisions, according to a person familiar with the message."

That is quite interesting coming this long after evidence was slapping people in the face, figuratively speaking. It appears that evidence that is overly compelling also may not actually sway Chris Wray into taking actions as the Director of the FBI that a reasonable and prudent Director of the FBI would have taken under the same or similar circumstances.

"Mr. Wray thanked Mr. McCabe for his service, adding"—I guess that in-

cludes the politicalization, the weaponizing, of the FBI in which Mr. McCabe was involved—"that Mr. McCabe said he would take leave immediately following a conversation between the two, the person said. The email was first reported by *The New York Times*."

"In the message, Mr. Wray also said he wouldn't comment on a pending report from the Justice Department's inspector general, or inhouse watchdog, which is expected to criticize the FBI's handling of an investigation into Hillary Clinton's email arrangement when she was Secretary of State. The report is expected to prompt some personnel changes."

You think?

"Mr. McCabe's decision Monday was a surprise to many inside the FBI"—apparently those who had gotten used to it being weaponized and politicized.

"Officials abruptly canceled a press conference to discuss an unrelated criminal operation. . . ."

It goes on to say: "The U.S. intelligence community, in January 2017, said it believed Russia had conducted an influence operation with the goal of hurting Mrs. Clinton and helping Mr. Trump in the 2016 Presidential election."

Gee, okay, so this article is citing the U.S. intelligence community. I guess that would include the part of the intelligence community that made the decision in 2012, along with the State Department—that would be Secretary of State Hillary Clinton—to leave the Ambassador to Libya exposed to grave danger, and even after seeing footage of attacks, the same intelligence community that decided they were better off leaving people to die and ordering four heroes to stand down and not go protect the Ambassador and others from dying, that same intelligence community. How about that?

They, apparently, according to the article, said they believed Russia conducted an influence operation. It turns out the same intelligence community that couldn't stand George W. Bush and leaked plenty of information to hurt his Presidency, and also has done a great job of leaking material to hurt President Trump's administration, if this article is correct, they helped the weaponized Department of Justice launch an investigation into potential Russian influence.

It is just so amazing, when we start finding out facts that there was a dossier that Fusion GPS was involved in getting, strictly an opposition research effort that ended up having totally fabricated, really outrageously outlandish allegations, and according to the news media, what was in that dossier was so outrageous, if you were a Russian, you would think, these stupid Americans will have to be out of their minds to think that Donald Trump would have done something like this. But maybe—maybe—the now weaponized Department of Justice in America and the Obama administration when coupled

with the Clinton campaign, maybe they are crazy enough to think Donald Trump would do something like this. It is going to end up making them look bad in the end, and that would certainly affect the election if the campaign were crazy enough to utilize such a totally fabricated dossier, I guess that would affect the election.

I still have trouble getting over the decision to tell American heroes to stand down, don't go try to save the lives of our Ambassador and the others there with the Ambassador. Tyrone Woods, Ty, was not going to have any of it. He and the other heroes headed out there to help as they could, including willingness to lay down their lives to protect other Americans, something the CIA station chief, in collaboration with other "U.S. intelligence community," apparently decided was not worthwhile.

This article goes on to say: "Mr. McCabe's abrupt departure is the latest event in a highly unusual back-and-forth between the Trump administration and a Federal law enforcement establishment that is both investigating him as it works for him and cherishes its independence."

We know that is not true. They don't cherish their independence. Oh, yeah, the FBI, in other levels, absolutely does. But then, at the same time, they also cherish their good working relationship with other local and State law enforcement.

This article further down said: "Mr. McCabe's resignation also comes as the FBI faces fallout from thousands of text messages between an FBI agent and lawyer who were involved in the Russia investigation, including some texts harshly critical of Mr. Trump."

How about that? The lawyer working for Mr. McCabe.

Apparently, Mr. McCabe is racing the clock to retire with full benefits as the President himself tweeted out. I can't help but still go back to the former Director of the FBI, Mr. Mueller, who set up a personnel program that would ensure that the thousands and thousands of years of incredible law enforcement experience that was obtained by honorable, honest FBI supervisors—that they would be run off by Mr. Mueller. He didn't want those people hanging around.

□ 2130

He put a personal policy in place that ran off thousands of years of incredible law enforcement experience from the FBI.

I can't help but think that if Mr. Mueller had not had such a policy to get rid of people that had great experience in law enforcement from the FBI, there would have been people who could have gently nudged people like Andrew McCabe or Mr. Strzok or Lisa Page and would have warned them when they were getting close to the edge before they got into such total politicization of our important FBI and DOJ. But those people weren't there

because Director Mueller put in place a policy that ran them off.

I still wonder about the victims at the Boston Marathon bombing. Had we had an FBI Director that was as interested in seeking out radical Islamist killers as he was in having community outreach with the mosque that was started by a man who is now doing 23 years in Federal prison for supporting terrorism, if he had not been so interested in playing patty-cake out with his community partnership and instead gone to the mosque and been asking specific questions about the older Tsarnaev brother after we got two notices that he had been radicalized—they never asked a question, not one, about Tsarnaev; about what he has been concentrating on, what he is reading, what he is memorizing, what he is talking about, what books he has got. They didn't know what questions to ask because Director Mueller had seen to the purging of the FBI training materials so the FBI agents didn't know what questions to ask. They didn't know what they were looking for in a radicalized Islamist.

The same scenario has played out time and again. Tsarnaev should have never been able to carry out that bombing, because he came into the crosshairs of the FBI investigation. Basically, from all we can find out from the hearings, they asked him if he was a terrorist. He said he wasn't. They asked his mom if he was a terrorist. She said: He is a good boy.

That is an encapsulation of it. But they didn't know what to ask because of Mueller.

Michele Bachmann and I reviewed material that was purged. The FBI classified it so we couldn't reveal, Mr. Speaker, to others publicly what was purged. Some of it was silly and needed to be purged.

Say, for example, there were a purging of verses from the Koran. Why should anything ever be purged from the Koran if it is part of the training materials?

You have to ask Mr. Mueller that.

The FBI and the DOJ deserve better. We are looking forward to finding out what the IG report has to say, but it is time for games to stop. It is time for law enforcement to do their jobs at the Department of Justice and the FBI. Jeff Sessions has got his hands full. It was obvious that he felt like he could trust those who were called career DOJ employees. Hopefully he has learned some of those career employees didn't have the law enforcement long in the tooth to give them the benefit of their experience because Mueller ran them off. They got off into an area of politicization of the DOJ and the FBI. He can't trust the people he would have been able to otherwise, had the FBI not gotten so far off track.

We need a second special counsel, as I advised the President back in June, and we need it now. Investigations cannot be conducted by Mueller into what Mueller did during the prior Russian

investigation, along with U.S. Attorney Rod Rosenstein, and could not properly investigate his joined-at-the-hip friend, Mr. Comey.

He could not properly investigate what will be in the inspector general's report, but it certainly should require further investigation. He can't do that. It needs to be totally independent. I am not talking about the godfather of one of Mr. Comey's kids, Patrick Fitzgerald, who conveniently got appointed after he talked John Ashcroft into recusing himself. I am talking about somebody totally independent. That is what we need.

Where does the DOJ go to get its reputation back?

It is going to be a long process and it is going to take truly independent people cleaning up the mess that has been created so that can happen. We need a reputable Department of Justice and FBI, and it is high time we got one back.

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

RUSSIAN INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for 22 minutes.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today by JARED HUFFMAN from California. And eventually, I think, BRENDAN BOYLE from Philadelphia, the home of the new NFC champions, is also going to join us.

What we are going to talk about is: What are the Republicans afraid of? What is it they are hiding? What is it they think is going on with respect to this investigation of the President and his ties to Russia?

It starts from the very beginning. This time last year, we asked the President: Are you going to turn over your tax returns so that people can see what is in your tax returns; whether you have relations with the Russians, or who knows who?

Every President for the last 40 or 50 years has turned over their tax returns. But, of course, the President did not turn over his tax returns and has refused to turn over his tax returns.

The first thing you ask is: What is in there? What are you hiding?

Now, what we see is a concerted effort by the Republicans in the Congress and in the White House to smear and disparage hardworking law enforcement officers in the FBI, in the intelligence community, and the Department of Justice, who have been tasked with trying to figure out whether or not Russia involved itself criminally in our elections last year and whether or not there is any implication of the Trump campaign with respect to those particular efforts by the Russians.

We need to make sure that Russia does not hack into our elections, does not participate in a way that favors one party over another or one candidate over another.

These investigations started and the first thing the President did was fire Jim Comey from the FBI. Through a process, the Justice Department then appoints a special prosecutor, a special counsel, to continue this investigation.

Since that has occurred, there have been a couple of indictments and a couple of plea agreements. Michael Flynn, who was the intelligence head for the President, has faced part of this investigation. There was Paul Manafort and Richard Gates, who were involved in the campaign, and then George Papadopoulos.

But that is just the tip of the iceberg. All these people, both on the Trump campaign side and all of these Russians, have played some kind of a role, and this investigation must be pursued.

My friends on the Republican side of the aisle can complain, can stomp their feet, can throw mud at the individuals who are asked to do these investigations, but these investigations must continue so that the people understand exactly what happened and to make sure that the Russians are not allowed to participate and infiltrate and affect our elections once again.

There are just a couple of questions: What are you afraid of? What are you hiding? Is there a coverup of some kind here?

The bottom line is: just let our law enforcement individuals do their detective work, do what they were asked to do, and leave them alone and let it be done. If it exculpates and proved that nothing happened, then great. But if there is some wrongdoing here, America needs to know about it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from northern California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for organizing this Special Order hour conversation.

You asked the right question: What are they hiding and what are they afraid of?

It is a bit of a rhetorical question, because when you think about that chart you have displayed there, when you think about the indictments and the plea deals and all of the other information that we are beginning to glean, it is pretty obvious what they are afraid of and what they are hiding.

This investigation is getting pretty darn close to the personal and political and financial ties between this Presidency and those around him and Russia, and it is a lot of information that they don't want the world to know about. That is why we are seeing all of these distractions, all of these elaborate and increasingly desperate attempts to change the subject and create diversions.

Frankly, today, I am very worried that—not so much that this is coming from our President, because we have seen him throughout his career engage in character assassination, burning down the house tactics, and all manner of ruthlessness, but I am disturbed that

many of our colleagues in this body have taken up those same tactics and that same cause. That is dangerous.

One of the great things about this country, I believe, is that it is about the rule of law. Our Founders actively debated this question about whether we would be a country of laws and institutions or a country of men.

Would we have some people above the law or would we all be subject to the law?

They answered it loud and clear. We were going to be a country of law and institutions. At every critical test in our history, we have reaffirmed that essential great aspect of what it is to be the United States of America. That is what Watergate was all about, as we are beginning to remember.

Yet, today, it seems that that proposition is being retested all over again. To my dismay, some of our colleagues are hoping for a different answer as we retest that proposition this time. That is very troubling.

I am not in the habit of quoting FOX News very often, and certainly not their news hosts, but one of their hosts, Shepard Smith, said something that really struck a cord in the last few days. Here is what he said about the so-called Nunes memo: "A memo can be a weapon of partisan mass distraction."

That is exactly what this is: a desperate attempt to protect President Trump from investigation and accountability.

I think we need to recap a few facts that brought us to this point.

Back in November 2016, when the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee was appointed to President-elect Trump's transition team, he, like our President, started sowing doubts about whether Russia had interfered with the 2016 election, incorrectly claiming that there was some kind of disagreement between our intelligence agencies on the subject.

In fact, there was no disagreement. All of the American intelligence community agreed that, as they had looked into this, they determined that Russian operatives had worked to undermine the integrity of our election. That conclusion has been reinforced and reaffirmed by everything we have learned since then.

The chairman told Politico shortly before President Trump's inauguration that the House should not investigate contacts between Russia and the Trump camp, even though his Senate intelligence counterparts had already committed to following the facts wherever they may lead. So he had already made up his mind.

□ 2145

The chairman described the Trump-Russia connections as a dead trail. He said there is nothing there. And, of course, we know President Trump has said he has nothing to do with Russia, totally contradicted by everything we have learned since.

All of this, of course, is going to come as a surprise if there is nothing

there to the President's campaign chair, who is under indictment; to members of his family, who have been hauled before the special prosecutor to answer to secret meetings and other dealings that they have had with Russia; and to others in this administration who had repeated contacts with Russia.

And, of course, no one can forget the intelligence chairman's trip to the White House last year, where he staged an impromptu news conference, claiming that he had briefed the White House about a source who could explain how Trump campaign officials were caught up in foreign intelligence intercepts. His unnamed sources that he rushed to brief the White House about, well, it turned out they were White House officials.

This was a completely choreographed stunt. They had planted the misleading information with the chairman in the first place, obviously desperate to give some cover to the President who had tweeted out about wiretapping, conspiracies, and on it goes.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, ED PERLMUTTER, is asking all of the right questions. This investigation is beginning to answer those questions in very, very important ways. We need to make sure that it runs its course. It is important to finding out the truth. The American people deserve to know the truth.

It is also important to reaffirming that incredibly important aspect of what makes this country great, and that is that we are a nation of laws and institutions. We have to reaffirm that, unfortunately, over and over again from time to time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for his comments. He was talking about a memo.

One of the former chairmen of the House Intelligence Committee, a guy named MIKE ROGERS, was also a panelist, I think, on a CNN program. Apparently, this memo is going to be released today against all sorts of norms with respect to the Intelligence Committee and classified information. His words were, releasing a memo like this is farcical.

It is a mistake. It starts to undermine so many things with respect to our intelligence community, the trust that we have with our allies, and all of it to kind of put up this smoke screen. They go after the law enforcement agents, who are the detectives on the beat. Now they are releasing information that is incomplete and, in MIKE ROGERS's words, "farcical," to try to distract, divert, avoid the real conversation, which is: What did the Russians do? How did they play in the elections? Was there any kind of cooperation, collusion, whatever it might be, with the Trump campaign?

We know that Bob Mueller was appointed. He has been a lifelong Republican. Everybody embraced his position as special counsel when it first came about, but quickly the President was

thinking about firing him. Now people want to smear all of this: It is a mistake.

The real question is: What are you hiding?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), my friend from Philadelphia, who is a pretty happy camper because his Eagles are going to be playing in the Super Bowl on Sunday.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for his belief early on in the season in the Eagles, despite the fact he is a die-hard Broncos fan. The Super Bowl will be a nice diversion from the seriousness of the subject that we are discussing and debating tonight.

Let me take us back a bit to a couple of events that, yes, may have happened a little bit before I was born, but I know well as a student of American history. I fear that we are on the verge of repeating them, possibly only days away on the verge of repeating them.

In October 1973, the Watergate investigation was being conducted by the special counsel, Archibald Cox. It had been going on, at that point, for most of 1973. On a Saturday night, President Nixon decided to fire the special counsel, in part, because the special counsel was doing his job and was getting too close to uncovering the conspiracy.

President Nixon ordered his Attorney General to fire the special counsel. The Attorney General proved to be a profile in courage and refused. It then went to the Deputy Attorney General. The Deputy Attorney General refused. Finally, the number three man, the Solicitor General, named Robert Bork, decided that he would follow what President Nixon wanted and fired Archibald Cox. That became known as the Saturday Night Massacre.

When John Chancellor, then the anchor for NBC News, came on the air—and I was recently rewatching this—he said: Tonight, I utter words I never thought I would say, but we are in the midst of the greatest constitutional crisis in the history of the Republic.

I fear that history may very well repeat itself. We now know, since we were last in session—and it has been reported and confirmed by many media outlets, including FOX News—that President Trump has ordered his own White House attorney to fire the special counsel.

Why? If the President really has nothing to hide, then why would he fire the special counsel and want to bring this process to an end? It gets back to the very first question that my colleague from Colorado has asked: What does he have to hide?

I sincerely hope that the special counsel will find and will prove that nothing happened. That would be the best outcome and best course for all of us as Americans. But, boy, if the President is innocent, he sure isn't acting like it.

We must come together—as Democrats and Republicans second, but as

Americans first—and do what is in the best interest of justice and of this country and say that the special counsel must be allowed to continue his work until its natural conclusion.

If the President moves to fire the special counsel, that, by its very definition, is obstructing justice. This body and the other body on the other side of this building cannot allow that to happen.

Here is the good news. In Watergate, ultimately, the American people didn't let it happen. There was such an outcry on a bipartisan basis that, within 48 hours, President Nixon had relented and appointed another special counsel, Leon Jaworski, who ended up being just as dogged, pursued the President all the way to the Supreme Court. Then the Supreme Court ruled, unanimously, that President Nixon had to hand over the tapes even though three of the eight Justices were Nixon appointees.

President Nixon, actually, to his credit, complied with that Supreme Court order and released the tapes, including a few tapes that clearly proved he was guilty—the so-called smoking gun—and, within about a week or two, resigned in August of 1974.

We can prevent that history from repeating itself if we act here in Congress to ensure there is a proper procedure in place to protect the integrity of this investigation. If that does not take place, there will be, I predict, an outcry of the American people you have not seen or heard since October 1973. This country and its institutions are a heck of a lot more important than any political party, and it is about time all of us in this body act in such a way that shows we believe in those words.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for the history lesson he just reminded us about. His words are ones that I don't think I can add anything to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), my friend, if he has anything else to add.

But I just want the Speaker to know and I want this Chamber to know that we are not going to go away. We are not going to allow things to be hidden. We are not going to allow things to be covered up. This has got to run its full course, just as my friend said.

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

We are being taken back to the lessons of Watergate tonight. The system worked in the 1970s. The checks and balances that our Founders put in place took effect. The public stepped up. The media stepped up. People of conscience in important positions within the government stood their ground and did the right thing.

But I think it would be foolish for us not to take the threats of this moment in our history very, very seriously because there are some things at play this time around that weren't there in the 1970s. You did not have rightwing media organs out there actively trying

to undermine public trust in our government. You did not have a complicit United States Congress that, instead of doing oversight, seems to be spending more of its effort running cover for the administration, trying to hide the facts, trying to block investigations, playing tribal politics at its worst, instead of fulfilling our institutional role in a critical constitutional test like this.

I think it is a very, very serious moment in our history, and I am glad that the gentleman is convening discussions like this on the floor. We have to make sure that, in this investigation, the professional law enforcement personnel who do this for a living are allowed to do their job so that we can all learn the truth, whatever that may be.

The question is: What are they afraid of? What are they hiding?

This investigation is going to answer those questions, and we will all accept those answers, whatever they may be, but we have got to let the system work.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership tonight.

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCCLINTOCK (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and January 30 on account of an illness.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and January 30 on account of death in family.

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. 1873. An act to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program to establish peer specialists in patient aligned care teams at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 30, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Of-

ficial Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2017.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jan Schakowsky	11/16	11/18	Bangladesh		490.00						490.00
	11/19	11/22	Myanmar		369.00						369.00
							13,522.61				13,522.61
Committee total					859.00		13,522.61				14,381.61

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DIANE BLACK, Jan. 10, 2018.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

3832. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department’s report entitled “Audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund’s Fiscal Years 2017 and 2016 Financial Statements”, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5302(c)(2); Jan. 30, 1934, ch. 6, Sec. 10 (as amended by Public Law 97-258, Sec. 5302(c)(2)); (96 Stat. 994); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3833. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Technical Amendments to Rules on Registration and Review of Exchange Disciplinary, Access Denial or Other Adverse Actions (RIN: 3038-AE15) received January 22, 2018, 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.

3834. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Agency Reorganization (RIN: 3133-AE81) received January 22, 2018, 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.

3835. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department’s final regulations — National Institute on Disability Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) and Independent Living Programs, Outdated, Superseded Regulations (RIN: 1820-AB76) received January 24, 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.

3836. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Administration’s report to Congress entitled, “Ninth Annual Report on Delays in Approvals of Applications Related to Citizen Petitions and Petitions for Stay of Agency Action for Fiscal Year 2016”, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 355(q)(3); Public Law 110-85, Sec. 914(a); (121 Stat. 956); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3837. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s interim final rule — Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects: Delay of the Revisions to the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects received Jan-

uary 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3838. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Annual Update of Filing Fees [Docket No.: RM18-3-000] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3839. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s interim final rule — Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects: Delay of the Revisions to the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (RIN: 0937-AA06) received January 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3840. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Confidentiality of Substance Use Disorder Patient Records [SAMHSA-4162-20] (RIN: 0930-ZA07) 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 Energy and Commerce.

3841. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s 2018 Report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 4605(f)(2); Public Law 96-72, Sec. 6(f)(2) (as amended by Public Law 99-64, Sec. 108(e)); (99 Stat. 133); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3842. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a designation of acting officer, nomination, and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3843. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board’s Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3844. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office’s final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program: Removal of Eligible and Ineligible Individuals from Existing

Enrollments (RIN: 3206-AN09) received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3845. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3846. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Adjustment of Civil Penalties for Inflation for Fiscal Year 2018 [NRC-2016-0166] (RIN: 3150-AJ83) received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3847. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board’s final rule — Civil Monetary Penalties — 2018 Adjustment [Docket No.: EP 716 (Sub-No.: 3)] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3848. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Division of Legislation and Regulations, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Revision of the America’s Marine Highway Program Regulations (RIN: 2133-AB84) received January 25, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3849. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Division of Legislation and Regulations, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Requirements To Document U.S.-Flag Fishing Industry Vessels of 100 Feet or Greater in Registered Length (RIN: 2133-AB86) received January 25, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3850. A letter from the Paralegal, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform [Docket No.: FHWA-2017-0003] (FHWA RIN: 2125-AF75; FTA RIN: 2132-AB33) received January 25, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3851. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Fees for the Unified Carrier Registration Plan and Agreement [Docket No.: FMCSA-2017-0118] (RIN: 2126-AC03) received January 25, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3852. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Division of Legislation and Regulations, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Maritime Security Program (RIN: 2133-AB85) received January 25, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3853. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0500; Product Identifier 2017-NM-009-AD; Amendment 39-19142; AD 2018-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 25, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3854. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0660; Product Identifier 2017-NE-21-AD; Amendment 39-19132; AD 2017-26-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 25, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3855. A letter from the Chair, National Science Board, transmitting the Board's Science and Engineering Indicators (Indicators) 2018 report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1863(j)(1); May 10, 1950, ch. 171, Sec. 4(j)(1) (as amended by Public Law 110-69, Sec. 7016); (121 Stat. 684); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

3856. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Additional Guidance Under Sections 965 and Guidance Under Sections 863 and 6038 in Connection with the Repeal of Section 958(b)(4) [Notice 2018-13] received January 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2255. A bill to clarify that nonprofit organizations may accept donated mortgage appraisals, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4792. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for small businesses affected by hurricanes or other natural disasters, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1426. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act to allow Federal savings associations to elect to operate as

national banks, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4281. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 219. A bill to correct the Swan Lake hydroelectric project survey boundary and to provide for the conveyance of the remaining tract of land within the corrected survey boundary to the State of Alaska (Rept. 115-532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2711. A bill to designate a National Memorial to Fallen Educators at the National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia, Kansas; with an amendment (Rept. 115-533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3058. A bill to redesignate the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in the State of Missouri as the "Gateway Arch National Park" (Rept. 115-534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 443. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the James K. Polk Home in Columbia, Tennessee, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2630. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to La Paz County, Arizona, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 115-536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. CHENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 714. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 695) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-537). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BARR, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. BACON, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr.

DESANTIS, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BOST, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 4886. A bill to make permanent certain provision of Public Law 115-97; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOX (for herself, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. ISSA, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 4887. A bill to modernize Federal grant reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CRIST, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BASS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 4888. A bill to provide that the production safety systems rule and the well control rule in section 250 of title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, shall have the same force and effect of law as if such rules had been enacted by an Act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 4889. A bill to cap the emissions of greenhouse gases through a requirement to purchase carbon permits, to distribute the proceeds of such purchases to eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 4890. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9801 Apollo Drive in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, as the "Wayne K. Curry Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4891. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to provide for the expansion of emergency planning zones and the development of plans for dry cask storage of spent nuclear fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4892. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 with respect to nutrient and soil health management and source water protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4893. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to establish an interagency working group to study Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence and to make recommendations on the harmonization of such efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4894. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide temporary relief from the annual fee imposed on health insurance providers; 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 4895. A bill to establish the Medgar Evers National Monument in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr.

RICHMOND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. LOVE, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. VEASEY):

H. Res. 715. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Memphis sanitation workers' strike; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BERA, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 716. A resolution recognizing the importance of the 2018 Winter Olympic Games in PyeongChang, South Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GAETZ (for himself, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BARR, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. BRAT, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BLUM, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H. Res. 717. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that

the so-called "FISA memo", a document prepared by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and any ancillary information, should be released to the public; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H. Res. 718. A resolution condemning the actions taken by the Government of the Republic of Cameroon against Patrice Nganang and others, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. FOX:

H.R. 4887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution grants the Congress the authority to enact this law.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 4888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 4889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 4890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3; To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 4893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the 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 any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4894.

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. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 4895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 20: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 172: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 217: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 350: Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 365: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 449: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 466: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 502: Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 604: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 611: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 620: Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 669: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 681: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 731: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 743: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 795: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 807: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 853: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 881: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 927: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 982: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 997: Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 1002: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1155: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1205: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1229: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1318: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1341: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1426: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1458: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1536: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 1606: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. VISCSLOSKY.

H.R. 1639: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1810: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1818: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1820: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1864: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1880: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1928: Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. GAETZ, Mr.

RATCLIFFE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SIRES, Mr. TIP-TON, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2092: Ms. TITUS and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2150: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2166: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2215: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2220: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2255: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2285: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2287: Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 2307: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 2319: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 2392: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2452: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2492: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 2501: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2591: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 2603: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 2651: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2723: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 2740: Mr. REED and Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 2785: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 2820: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2832: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 2952: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3018: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 3030: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DENT, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 3425: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3497: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3528: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3563: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3566: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3637: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3642: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 3666: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3671: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3692: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3730: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 3738: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3773: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 3828: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3842: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3860: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3894: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 3942: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3945: Mr. NADLER and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3964: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3976: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORREA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 3988: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4001: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 4013: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4035: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 4097: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4099: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4101: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 4107: Mr. SERRANO, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4115: Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 4146: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4158: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 4184: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 4203: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 4221: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4229: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 4238: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4253: Mr. MCEACHIN and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 4274: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 4311: Mr. MESSER and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 4312: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 4319: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 4345: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. JONES, Mr. COOK, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. MAST, and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 4369: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4392: Mr. KEATING and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 4424: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 4426: Mrs. DEMINGS and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4446: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4489: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 4494: Mr. MCCCLINTOCK and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 4525: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4526: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4527: Mr. GOMEZ and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 4547: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 4548: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4549: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4556: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 4565: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4575: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 4582: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 4666: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 4684: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 4691: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4704: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4706: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 4719: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 4720: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4729: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4734: Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4743: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 4744: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 4747: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 4760: Mr. MCCCLINTOCK, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 4767: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4775: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4780: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 4803: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4824: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 4831: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 4844: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 4871: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. FOSTER.
H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Con. Res. 10: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. MARINO, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. CRAMER.
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H. Con. Res. 72: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 128: Mrs. NOEM.
H. Res. 188: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 199: Mr. MAST.
H. Res. 257: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 301: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 466: Mr. DENT, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H. Res. 621: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 673: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 684: Mr. GAETZ.
H. Res. 692: Mr. BLUM and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 697: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 699: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. CAPUANO.
H. Res. 707: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H. Res. 711: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 115TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, prior to sine die adjournment of the First Session of the 115th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and of the following titles:

December 18, 2017:

H.R. 228. An Act to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes.

December 22, 2017:

H.R. 1. An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

H.R. 1370. An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, prior to sine die adjournment of the First Session of the 115th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates,

he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

December 18, 2017:

S. 371. An Act to make technical changes and other improvements to the Department of State authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017.

December 20, 2017:

S. 1266. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with nonprofit organizations to investigate medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE AD- JOURNMENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, prior to sine die adjournment of the First Session of the 115th Congress, reported that on December 29, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 2331. To require a new or updated Federal website that is intended for use by the public to be mobile friendly, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2142. To improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2228. To provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 863. To facilitate the addition of park administration at the Coltsville National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 699. To amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon.

H.R. 381. To designate a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest as "Sky Point".

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, prior to sine die adjournment of the First Session of the 115th Congress, further reported that on January 2, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 2611. To modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4661. To reauthorize the United States Fire Administration, the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 954. To remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 518. To amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to exclude power supply circuits, drivers, and devices designed to be connected to, and power, light-emitting diodes or organic light-emitting diodes providing illumination from energy conservation standards for external power supplies, and for other purposes.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 115TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE AD- JOURNMENT

The President, after sine die adjournment of the First Session of the 115th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

January 3, 2018:

H.R. 4661. An Act to reauthorize the United States Fire Administration, the Assistance to Firefighters Grants Program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes.

January 8, 2018:

H.R. 267. An Act to redesignate the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 560. An Act to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1242. An Act to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1306. An Act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1927. An Act to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish within the National Park Service the African American Civil Rights Network, and for other purposes.

January 10, 2018:

H.R. 381. An Act to designate a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest as “Sky Point”.

H.R. 699. An Act to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon.

H.R. 863. An Act to facilitate the addition of park administration at the Coltsville National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2142. An Act to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2228. An Act to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2331. An Act to require a new or updated Federal website that is intended for use by the public to be mobile friendly, and for other purposes.

January 12, 2018:

H.R. 518. An Act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to exclude power supply circuits, drivers, and devices designed to be connected to, and power, light-emitting diodes or organic light-emitting diodes providing illumination from energy conservation standards for external power supplies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 954. An Act to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2611. An Act to modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE AD- JOURNMENT

The President, after sine die adjournment of the First Session of the 115th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

January 3, 2018:

S. 1536. An Act to designate a human trafficking prevention coordinator and to expand the scope of activities authorized under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's outreach and education program to include human trafficking prevention activities, and for other purposes.

S. 2273. An Act to extend the period during which vessels that are shorter than 79 feet in length and fishing vessels are not required to have a permit for discharges incidental to the normal operation of the vessel.

January 8, 2018:

S. 1393. An Act to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses.

S. 1532. An Act to disqualify from operating a commercial motor vehicle for life an individual who uses a commercial motor vehicle in committing a felony involving human trafficking.

S. 1766. An Act to reauthorize the SAFER Act of 2013, and for other purposes.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2018

No. 19

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.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.

Eternal God, we lift our hearts to You. You are the source of our strength. You are our hope for tomorrow. Continue to show our lawmakers the path where they should walk, leading them to Your desired destination. Lord, inspire them to continuously put their hope in You. As they remember Your unfailing love and compassion, remind them that nothing is impossible to those who believe.

We pray in Your powerful 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to

proceed to S. 2311, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 294, S. 2311, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

If no one yields time, then time will be charged equally.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the odds are quite good that when this Republican-controlled Congress closes up shop in December, time spent attacking the healthcare of women is going to be right up at the top of how this Congress spent their day. They are back at it again, and this latest attack that we will be discussing this week goes after women's essential healthcare decisions.

In my view—and I want to be very clear about this point—this is another key part of the Trump agenda of healthcare discrimination. This time, it is going after women. This entire agenda is what the Republicans are doing their best to blast through the Congress into law. It is not just a one-off, either.

So I am going to spend a few minutes now to put this particular health proposal that discriminates against women in the appropriate kind of context. To do that, I think it is important to describe what has happened on healthcare since day one of the Trump administration.

The administration and Republicans in Congress came right out of the gate with legislation that would have deprived hundreds of thousands of women of the right to see the doctor of their choosing. There was another attack on Planned Parenthood that completely ignored the fact that the Congress already regulates what these trusted

healthcare providers can and cannot spend public funds on. What Planned Parenthood does use public funding for are vital healthcare services that have absolutely nothing to do with abortion. Let me just make sure people understand what I am talking about. We are talking about cancer screenings, prenatal care, preventive services, routine physicals, and more.

I have townhall meetings in every county in our State. I have had more than 860 of them. The vast amount of terrain in Oregon is rural. When I go to those small communities and the least populated areas of our State, that is what people tell me they go to Planned Parenthood for—to get those basic essentials, ranging from cancer screenings to routine physicals. That is what women would lose with this Trump agenda of healthcare discrimination.

Next up, given the way the year and a little bit longer has evolved, is the ongoing attempt by the Trump administration to deny women guaranteed no-cost access to contraception. This is one of the most popular healthcare policies in recent memory. There are a lot of reasons why this is smart, not just because it is a matter of fairness for all women to have access to birth control. When women have access to contraception, it means healthier pregnancies and healthier newborns. It also reduces the risk of cancer among women.

You can also look at it in terms of dollars and cents. When you take away no-cost contraception, you are essentially taxing women based on their gender. You are driving up the cost of their routine healthcare. It flies in the face of everything my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say about the problems of healthcare costs in America.

So those are strikes one and two: denying women the right to see the doctor of their choosing and making it harder for them to access contraception. Now the Senate is debating

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S527

whether to throw a matter of settled law out the window with a hyperpartisan ban on abortion after 20 weeks.

My view on abortion throughout my time in public service is it ought to be safe, it ought to be legal, and it ought to be rare. I have supported a whole host of policies that bring both sides of the aisle together.

The Presiding Officer is fairly new to the Senate Finance Committee and is looking to be involved in a host of issues. My guess is, he will be very interested in the adoption tax credit concept which I and others have championed for some time, something that brings both sides together.

So my view is, abortion, safe, legal, and rare; find ways to bring both sides together; and respect that the Federal Government ought to leave women alone on these most intimate decisions that involve women, their spouses, and their healthcare providers.

The proposal the Senate is now debating is all about telling women what they can and cannot do. It criminalizes healthcare services that ought to stay between women and their doctors—healthcare services often necessitated by potentially life-threatening complications.

I just, for the life of me, don't see the wisdom of a lawmaker or a bureaucrat in Washington, DC, or a State capital telling a woman how severe the danger to her life has to become before she is legally allowed to make this variably gut-wrenching decision to choose an abortion.

This issue has been settled law in America for 45 years. The debate should be over, but here it is again, along with these other policies I have just described, as part of the Trump administration's healthcare discrimination agenda which is particularly punitive against women.

Let me also recognize the biggest victims under this discriminatory agenda are women who walk an economic tightrope every single day. If their local Planned Parenthood clinic is forced to close its doors, they may not have the ability to take time off work and travel long distances to see another provider for routine healthcare. They already balance every day the food against the rent, the rent against electricity, electricity against gas. Take away these choices, like no-cost contraception, and make their struggle to get ahead that much harder—especially when the rate of unintended pregnancy is five times higher among women living in poverty—folks who may not be able to afford a plane ticket or even a bus ticket to somewhere where they can find the essential healthcare services they believe are necessary.

There are serious, genuine healthcare challenges that face the country. Millions of Americans get clobbered every single time they walk up to a pharmacy window and get pounded by the cost of prescription drugs. That is the

kind of bipartisan debate looking for solutions.

Another example is the opioid epidemic raging from one end of the country to the other. More than half a million lives lost in the last two decades, countless families and entire communities torn apart. The Congress and the Trump administration haven't done nearly enough to fight the crisis and, frankly, not anywhere near close to what was promised in the fall of 2016.

Instead of taking on these challenges, the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress are just full steam ahead with this agenda of healthcare discrimination; this week, an attack on women and their healthcare choices. Passing this bill is going to make it harder for women to be in a position to make the healthcare choices they believe are important—maybe essential—for their lives.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise to urge each of my colleagues to support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This critical legislation would prohibit a child from being aborted at 5 months of development.

For those we have watching today, I would like you to focus a little bit on these photos, and I will return to them in a moment.

Again, I am urging my colleagues to support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. By any measure, at 5 months of development, an unborn child is a child. At 5 months, babies have grown nails on their fingers and on their toes; hair has just begun to grow on their heads; and an ultrasound can tell an expectant mother or father whether their baby is a boy or a girl. These babies can detect light, hear sounds, they can swallow, and even experience taste as their taste buds grow and develop. These unborn babies in all ways are babies.

There is also significant scientific evidence that at 5 months of development these babies can feel pain. By 5 months, babies begin to respond to painful stimulus with distinctive pain response behaviors that are exhibited by older babies. They will scrunch their eyes, they will clench their hands, they pull back their limbs in response to pain, just like any other child experiencing pain.

There is also a great deal of evidence that stress hormone levels rise substantially when babies at this age are exposed to pain. In 2015, a Cambridge University Press medical textbook acknowledged that a "fetus . . . becomes capable of experiencing pain between 20 and 30 weeks of gestation." In fact, fetal surgeons routinely administer pain medications for babies after only 4 months of development. Doctors are giving babies pain medication after 4 months of development.

As modern medicine has recognized, these babies are humans capable of ex-

periencing pain. Yet there is no Federal law protecting these vulnerable humans from abortions. As a result, every year in our country the lives of thousands of babies end painfully through abortion. This is unacceptable. The majority of men and women across the Nation agree with this premise. According to a recent Marist poll, 6 out of 10 Americans surveyed support a law prohibiting abortion after 5 months of pregnancy.

Additionally, multiple States, including my home State of Iowa, have passed legislation that would prohibit abortions after 5 months of development because these babies are babies. There is no way to deny the humanity of these children when you consider stories like that of Micah Pickering.

Micah is from Newton, IA. He is a very young friend of mine. He is 5 years old. Just a few weeks ago on the floor of the Senate I was able to share Micah's story. As you may recall, Micah was born at just 20 weeks postfertilization—the very point at which the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would begin to protect these young lives. Today, Micah is a very happy, very energetic little 5-year-old. Now, I would like to go back to these pictures.

When I first met Micah, he was about 3 years old. He and his parents visited my office for the annual March for Life. I had this poster made of these pictures, and they were in my office because I was going to speak on the Senate floor in support of March for Life. Micah is pictured on the right side of the poster board. Micah, a happy, energetic little boy saw this poster board in my office, and he ran up to it—imagine, this beautiful 3-year-old boy—and he pointed not at the picture of himself as he was at 3 years old, but he pointed to this picture, and he said: Baby. I said: Yes, Micah, that is a baby.

This is Micah when he was born. Micah at 3 years old understood that this was a baby. He didn't understand that was him when he was born, but he understood that was a baby.

If you look at the picture, you will see Micah is grasping his mama and daddy's hands with five perfectly formed little fingers on each hand. It is a baby, folks. Micah knew that. While he might not have known that was him when he was born, he knew that was a baby—5 months of gestation.

Today, Micah is a happy, extraordinarily healthy young boy. I got to see him again this last year. Again, he was running around my office, just full of energy and life.

Yes, Micah, this is a baby. I agree.

Micah's story is not an isolated incident. Extraordinary stories of babies who are surviving after just 5 months of development can be found all around the world.

A little over a year ago, Dakota Harris was born in Ohio at 19 weeks of development—even younger than Micah. Last May, she left the hospital with her family as a healthy 7-pound baby.

In 2016, baby Aharon was born at 20 weeks of development, becoming the youngest premature baby to survive in Israel. After 5 months of care at a hospital in Tel Aviv, he was able to go home, again, as a healthy baby.

In 2010, Frieda Mangold, who was born in Germany at just under 20 weeks of development, became Europe's youngest premature baby to survive. After receiving intensive care, she too was able to go home with her family as a happy 7-pound baby.

Babies have been on record as surviving birth after just 5 months of development for three decades now—three decades. What greater evidence do you need that at 5 months of development, an unborn child in every way is a child?

Despite the clear evidence of the humanity of these children, the United States is one of only seven countries in the world to allow abortions after 5 months of development. That means that while an overwhelming majority of the world recognizes and protects the humanity of these vulnerable children, the United States keeps the company of countries like China and North Korea. They deny unborn children the most basic of protections. This is not who we are as a nation.

It is time we listen to the scientific evidence, the men and women across America, and a majority of the rest of the world. There should be no disagreement when it comes to protecting the life of an unborn child who can feel pain and, as the inspiring stories of Micah Pickering and others show, survive outside of the womb. It is up to us to ensure these children have the chance to grow up and lead the happy, healthy lives that God has granted them.

As a mother and a grandmother, I am urging my colleagues to support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which recognizes these unborn babies as the children they are and provides them the same protection from pain and suffering that all of our children deserve.

For my dear little friend Micah, I would say: Yes, Micah, this is a baby, and we are glad to have you here.

God bless him.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

If no one yields time, the time shall be charged equally.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I am here to talk about a vote we will be considering later this afternoon on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I thank Senator GRAHAM and my fellow cosponsors on the bill. I think it is

a very important bill. I think it is a balanced bill as it is a bill that has the support of the vast majority of the American citizens and would make us consistent with all but only seven other nations in terms of restricting abortions to a limited number of exceptions after 20 weeks. Those exceptions would be a threat to the life of the mother, someone who may have been raped, or someone who may have been the victim of incest.

This is a balanced bill, and it is a policy that most of the world population agrees should be in place. I think it is our job to make sure this restriction is put into place, with medical science today suggesting that after 20 weeks an unborn child can experience pain, while still allowing for the choice of the mother. We could discuss different opinions about that in the earlier terms but certainly after 20 weeks. I think this is balanced policy and is something I hope my colleagues will support and ultimately send to the President's desk.

I was speaker of the house in North Carolina for 4 years. We worked on commonsense changes to protect the lives of the unborn, changes that also received the support of the majority of North Carolinians. This is just another example of where we at the Federal level can enact a law that I think can help us to demonstrate that the life of the unborn is a precious life. We as Members of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. Congress are tasked with making sure we protect all lives in America. This is just a very important, precious, helpless part of the population. I, for one, think this is a great, modest step forward, and I encourage all of the Members to support it.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, last week marked the 45th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, but many of us were not celebrating because last week gave us another opportunity to consider the real damage caused by the Supreme Court decision, which even liberal scholars have now said is flawed in the type of damage it has done to the social fabric of our Nation over the last four and a half decades.

During this period of time, more than 50 million unborn children in America have been denied the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—50 million. In other parts of the world, unborn children have been killed by the sheer fact that they happen to be girls instead of boys or because one has a disability like Down syndrome.

For me, *Roe v. Wade* hits close to home because I come from the State where the lead plaintiff was living at the time of that now famous lawsuit. Her name is Norma McCorvey, or Jane Roe in the case. She was from Dallas, TX. What is unknown, generally, but interesting, is what is left out of this story when you hear about Jane Roe in *Roe v. Wade*. Mrs. McCorvey, actually,

never went forward with the abortion. She gave birth instead, and her child was adopted. She later became an influential pro-life advocate.

Her story should give us cause for hope that change is possible—change of the human heart, change in the direction of the country—when it comes to unborn children, as should events like the March for Life that happened earlier this month here in Washington, where more than 100,000 pro-life men and women, young and old, descended on our Nation's Capital.

I want to applaud President Trump for becoming our Nation's first sitting President to address the march.

Hope is increasingly being provided by advances in science that have dispelled some of the mythology associated with abortion. Advancing technology is making it easier for many to see the humanity of a growing child and to realize that it does have moral status.

One physician at Northwestern University recounted recently:

The more advanced in my field of neonatology, the more it just became the logical choice to recognize the developing fetus for what it is. . . . It just became so obvious that these were just developing humans.

Testimony like that lends credence to the bill that we are voting on today. It is called the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I don't doubt that some of our colleagues would just prefer to remain silent and to hope this vote passes without many people paying much attention, but I hope that doesn't happen. It is an entirely appropriate occasion for us to talk about abortion and its role in our society and how it is increasingly out of step with modern science and people's recognition that these are indeed unborn human beings.

This legislation protects unborn children at 20 weeks, or 5 months. Who among us thinks that it is appropriate to have an elective abortion after 5 months in the womb? That is what we are talking about. We are specifically talking about the child's ability to feel pain at this stage of development. It doesn't apply in cases where the mother's life is at risk or in cases of rape or incest. It does have those exceptions.

Advances in modern medicine help babies born at 21 and 22 weeks to survive. In other words, we are talking about unborn children who could survive outside the womb, who are still subject to elective abortion in this country. So babies roughly the same age are clearly alive and need our protection before they are born as well, and this bill will help provide that protection.

Incredibly, the United States is only one of seven countries that allow elective abortions past 20 weeks. It is not exactly an honor to be in the same category as North Korea, Vietnam, and China when it comes to allowing elective abortions after 5 months.

I am glad that the pain-capable bill has passed in 20 States, including my

home State of Texas. It has been estimated that the law we are voting on today will save approximately 12,000 to 18,000 babies annually. That is 12,000 to 18,000 lives saved were this bill to pass. That is hopeful news.

Polls have shown that a majority of Americans support a prohibition on abortion after 20 weeks of pregnancy. This is one thing that brings people who consider themselves to be pro-life and people who consider themselves to be pro-choice together, common ground recognizing that at some point you are talking about a human being capable of living outside the womb.

As my colleague from Oklahoma, the junior Senator, told us on the floor recently, people all across the country are waking up. They are beginning to say, as he put it:

Wait a minute, that child has 10 fingers and 10 toes, unique DNA that is different from his or her mom and dad, [and] the child feels pain in the womb and has a beating heart. . . . That sounds like a child.

He is absolutely right. It sounds like a child because it is one.

I wish to close by quoting Winston Churchill, who I realize is perhaps an unlikely figure to bring up at a time like this. That great leader once said that “a nation that has forgotten its past has no future.”

Here in the United States, we have forgotten our past when it comes to abortion. We have forgotten, for example, that some of the original advocates of abortion had ties to the eugenics movement. They believed that you could eliminate people who had disabilities or who were frowned upon for one reason or another by virtue of their gender or other characteristics they had no control over. They often promoted forced sterilization because some people, in their view, simply shouldn't be allowed to reproduce. One example is Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, who is known to have spoken with the Ku Klux Klan and other disreputable organizations about her views.

We have forgotten, as well, the activists advocating on behalf of racial minorities in the 1960s and 1970s who once emphasized abortion's civil rights connection—that protecting the unborn represented an effort to protect the weak and the disenfranchised.

Respectfully, I call on all of our colleagues to remember these connections and to see how far we have come—and not in a positive way. These colleagues of mine often describe themselves as pro-choice, but they actually are not unique in that regard. We all attach value to choices. As others have said before, we all know that choices have consequences and that some are better than others.

Each of us represents the sum of his or her choices, too. As a society, we should choose to offer pregnant mothers who are worried, financially insecure, or alone options other than abortion. We not only should do this, but we must.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the pain-capable legislation we will be voting on in just a couple of hours.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am prepared to deliver remarks, but I see that the majority leader is on the floor, and I do not want to intrude on his desire to take the floor if he wishes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Rhode Island. I will not occupy the Senate floor for very long.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MARSHALL COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the community of Benton, KY, is continuing to pick up the pieces after last week's harrowing shooting.

I wish, once again, to thank our law enforcement and first responders for their heroism, and I would also like to recognize Marshall County Judge-Executive Kevin Neal for his leadership when his community needed it the most.

For most of us, this tragedy is barely even conceivable, but to the parents of Bailey Holt and Preston Cope, it is now a painful reality. Bailey Holt was 15 years old, and her mother said that she had a “perfect, sweet soul.” She has been described as compassionate, confident, and comfortable being herself. When she wasn't busy cheering for the University of Louisville Cardinals, Bailey was always ready with a kind word or a friendly gesture for those who needed it.

On social media, her family and friends are using the expression “Be Like Bailey,” encouraging everyone who sees it to act with charity.

Preston Cope, who was also 15, was known for being kind, soft-spoken, and a quick learner. He loved reading about history and playing baseball for Marshall County High School and the Calvert City Sluggers. Preston's friends remember his ability to inspire them and to make them laugh.

One of Bailey and Preston's classmates called them “the nicest people I ever met. They never had anything negative to say. They always had a smile on their face.”

This weekend, friends and family gathered at the high school gym by the hundreds to remember Bailey and Preston and to comfort one another.

As the other injured students fight to recover and the entire Marshall County community continues to grieve and heal, they will have Bailey and Preston's example to draw on and they will have the prayers of their fellow Kentuckians, of us here in the Senate, and of the entire country.

WORK OF THE SENATE

Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, a great deal of work remains in the Senate in the coming

days. Bipartisan discussions continue on a variety of important issues, including immigration, border security, disaster relief, healthcare, and funding for our Armed Forces. With our February 8 deadline fast approaching, it is vital that we continue these serious and constructive talks.

Last week, the administration provided its framework for immigration legislation. As I noted, it builds upon the four pillars for reform that the President has consistently put forth and indicates what is necessary for him to sign a bill into law. As discussions continue in the Senate on the subject of immigration, Members on both sides of the aisle should look to this framework as they work toward an agreement.

The President's proposal has received praise as a serious effort to solve some of the problems with our broken immigration system. Not surprisingly with a subject this complicated, it has also received criticism from both the right and the left. Constructive critiques are one thing, but the type of irresponsible racial invective used yet again on this subject by the Democratic leader of the House is decidedly unhelpful.

These comments are precisely the kind of divisive partisanship that dim the prospects that a bipartisan compromise could become law. The American people elected us to legislate, not to trade insults. To resolve President Obama's unlawfully established DACA Program and other important issues in immigration, I would urge my Democratic colleagues to put serious, good-faith discussions ahead of cheap, partisan point scoring.

NOMINATION OF DAVID STRAS

Mr. President, now on another matter. These negotiations aren't the only important business before us this week. We will also consider another of President Trump's well-qualified judicial nominees, David Stras, of Minnesota, to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Judge Stras serves as an associate justice of the Minnesota Supreme Court. Three of his former colleagues on that court, now retired, praised him in an open letter last year for his sterling academic record, his considerable experience, and his ability to hear cases “with objectivity and an open mind.”

Their testimony confirmed Judge Stras's well-known reputation for thoughtfulness, fairness, and intellectual excellence. I look forward to voting to advance his nomination and to send this capable jurist to the Federal bench.

Mr. President, the Senate will vote to take up a measure to ensure that the most vulnerable in our society are granted the protection they deserve under law. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act reflects a growing mainstream consensus—mainstream consensus—that unborn children should not be subjected to elective abortion after 20 weeks.

There are only seven countries left in the world that permit this, including,

unfortunately, the United States, along with China and North Korea. It is long past time that we heeded both science and commonsense morality and remove ourselves from this very undistinguished list.

Some refer to this legislation as Micah's Law in honor of a little boy who was born premature at just 22 weeks. Today, Micah Pickering is a healthy 5-year-old boy. He shows what can happen when we give life a chance.

This afternoon, every one of us will go on record on this issue. On the commonsense side of this issue are 63 percent of Americans, according to a recent survey, and every other country in the world, save seven. There is no reason why this should be a partisan issue. I hope our Democratic colleagues will not obstruct the Senate from taking up this bill.

I urge every one of my colleagues to join me in voting to advance it this afternoon.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. President, now, on a final matter, the President delivers his first State of the Union Address tomorrow. I am especially looking forward to his remarks on tax reform and the state of our economy. Already hundreds of businesses have announced significant bonuses, pay increases, new jobs, and expanded benefits. Just last week, we learned that Verst Logistics, which is based in Walton, KY, and employs nearly 1,600, has distributed bonuses to full-time employees. The company's CEO told workers: "I want to be sure that you and your families share in the benefits of your accomplishments and the new tax reform legislation."

When I hear my Democratic colleagues denigrate tax reform bonuses as "crumbs," I think about workers like these. I think about the Verst worker who came to her boss with tears in her eyes when she received word of her bonus. It was Christmas. She and her husband had recently had their fifth child. Money was tight. Mom and dad had enough saved up to buy gifts for the kids but were planning to skip presents for each other, but tax reform changed that. Thanks to the tax reform bonus she earned, this employee and her husband could go out to a nice dinner and buy each other Christmas gifts after all. The CEO says he has never been hugged so hard in his life.

It is a shame that none of my Democratic colleagues voted for tax reform—not a single one of them—and it is jarring to hear some of them now denigrate the pay increases and the benefits that only wealthy people could deem insignificant. Maybe in San Francisco or New York an extra \$500 or \$1,000 is no big deal, but try telling that to families in North Dakota, Missouri, and Montana. Try telling that to that mother of five. I suspect you would get an earful.

Tomorrow evening when the President describes tax reform's impact for middle-class Americans, every one of us should stand and applaud.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

EPA ADMINISTRATOR SCOTT PRUITT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, tomorrow the Environment and Public Works Committee will have an opportunity to question Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt at an oversight hearing. Oversight of the executive branch is one of the Senate's great responsibilities. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership of this body has shown little interest in holding the Trump administration accountable, despite the fact that this administration is more ethically challenged, more riven by conflicts of interest, more captured by special interests, more defined by cronyism than any other.

After a year of Pruitt at the helm of EPA—a tenure that has been marked by mass staff departures, a slowdown in enforcement actions, questionable travel and other personal spending, rolling back critical clean air and clean water protections, a purge of scientists, an influx of industry insiders, a smorgasbord of meetings with industry bigwigs, many of whom coincidentally also bankrolled his political career back in Oklahoma, an obsession with secrecy, and heaps and heaps and heaps of climate denial—Pruitt will finally be appearing before our committee. I urge my Republican colleagues on EPW to bring some good questions to tomorrow's hearing.

Judging by Pruitt's first year, he is running dangerously amok. He has turned EPA into perhaps the swampiest Agency in a very swampy administration. Pruitt's record at EPA demands the sort of oversight this body used to exercise. If you don't believe this about Pruitt's record, just take a look at what some distinguished Republicans have to say. William Ruckelshaus, who under both Presidents Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan ran the EPA, has criticized Pruitt's penchant for secrecy in this Washington Post op-ed contrasting it with his own more transparent management style. He said:

We release[d] my full schedule and the publication of written communications on a daily basis . . . Scott Pruitt is taking the absolute opposite approach. Pruitt operates in secrecy.

In an interview with HuffPost, former New Jersey Governor and chairman of the 9/11 Commission, Tom Kean, is also troubled by Pruitt's fixation with secrecy. I think this New York Times op-ed makes his opinion clear. He writes:

[T]o satisfy his penchant for secrecy, [Pruitt] is installing—at a cost of nearly \$25,000 to taxpayers—a secure phone booth in his Washington office to keep people, including staff members, in the dark.

Imagine that. While demanding massive cuts to EPA's budget, Pruitt is spending thousands of dollars to build himself, like Maxwell Smart, a cone of silence. He doesn't run the CIA. He

doesn't run the FBI. He doesn't even run the State Department. What possible purpose could this very expensive, secure phone booth have at the Environmental Protection Agency?

Governor Kean believes Pruitt is doing this to keep his own staff members in the dark, which begs the question: What does Pruitt have to hide from his own staff? It sounds like a question my Republican colleagues on EPW should ask him tomorrow.

Pruitt's wasteful spending isn't just limited to his cone of silence. As Governor Kean points out, Pruitt has used private jets costing taxpayers another \$58,000. His princely habits have even prompted questions from Senator GRASSLEY. So I ask my EPW Republican colleagues: If Senator GRASSLEY is troubled by Pruitt's wasteful spending of taxpayers' money on personal luxuries, shouldn't you ask him about it at tomorrow's hearing?

Pruitt's penchant for secrecy goes well beyond the expensive cone of silence that was designed to keep his own staff in the dark. It also extends to his schedule, where he tries to keep the American people in the dark. Unlike Ruckelshaus and previous EPA Administrators, Pruitt will not even disclose whom he is meeting or when he is traveling. As Governor Kean notes, our only idea of the folks he is meeting comes from the Freedom of Information Act. Once EPA finally released the first few months of Pruitt's calendars in response to a FOIA request, that is when we learned he was meeting with scores of industry fat cats and almost no environmental groups.

As for his travels, we only find out about them after the fact, which of course prevents the press from covering Pruitt, say, when he jets off to Morocco to lobby for American natural gas producers. One of my Republican colleagues on EPW might want to ask Pruitt why he is jetting around the world playing Commerce Secretary for the fossil fuel industry when he should be working here at home in America to protect people's health and their environment.

What does Governor Kean have to say about Pruitt's industry ties? "He has elevated cronyism to new heights." Those are Governor's Kean's words, not mine.

In an interview with HuffPost just this past Friday, Mr. Ruckelshaus echoed this concern that Pruitt cares more about his political ties than protecting the environment. "He's just like Trump," Ruckelshaus said. "He's got an ideological approach to it, an approach that affects the large contributors in his party in Oklahoma."

Here again, Republican colleagues on EPW might want to ask Pruitt about his close ties with industry and whether he is working for the fossil fuel interests that donated hundreds of thousands of dollars to his political activities back in Oklahoma or working for the American people. Governor Kean goes on to say that Pruitt "built his

political career by attacking clean-air and clean-water rules" and that he is "blocking scientific input," which brings us to science.

Science, of course, gives society its headlights to look ahead and see oncoming hazards. Without science, if we ignore it or block it, as Governor Kean says Pruitt is doing, the decisions we make are simply uninformed and irrational, and Governor Kean and I aren't the only ones who think this.

Yet another high-profile Republican, the former New Jersey Governor and George W. Bush EPA Administrator, Christine Todd Whitman, agrees. Pruitt claims he will pursue so-called "red team/blue team" exercises instead of the long-established gold standard peer review process for rigorously evaluating science. Governor Whitman sees right through that.

[D]ecisions must be based on reliable science. The red team begins with his politically preferred conclusion that climate change isn't a problem, and it will seek evidence to justify that position. That's the opposite of how science works.

Pruitt doesn't want to follow the scientific method, at least not when it comes to climate science or any other science, for that matter, that his industry backers object to. He wants to fabricate a case for his industry backers' politically preferred hypothesis. This isn't science. This is a counterfeit of science. As Governor Whitman writes, "True science follows the evidence. . . . Government bases policy on those results. This applies to liberals and conservatives alike," or at least that is the way it used to be before Scott Pruitt turned the keys over to polluting industries.

So, EPW Republicans, there is another question for you to ask Pruitt tomorrow: How does he justify throwing out the real scientists and the real science in order to arrive so predictably at the fossil fuel industry's preferred conclusions?

Governor Whitman calls Pruitt's climate denial scheming "a waste of the government's time, energy, and resources, and a slap in the face to fiscal responsibility and responsible governance." It is, in her words, "shameful," "unjustifiable," and a "wild goose chase." It sounds like more great questions for EPW Republicans to ask Pruitt tomorrow: How does he justify spending taxpayers' money on his backers' climate denial schemes.

This question is particularly relevant in light of Pruitt's campaign to radically cut EPA's budget and staff. Under his tenure, EPA staff has been reduced to the lowest level in more than 30 years. EPW Republicans, take note because here is another question you can ask Pruitt tomorrow: How can he justify spending taxpayer money on frivolities like his Maxwell Smart cone of silence or personal luxuries like exorbitant private travel or crazy climate denial schemes all while demanding drastic cuts to the people who do the real work of protecting the public at his Agency?

In an interview, Governor Whitman said she "would like to see [EPA's] budget have enough in it to ensure we are enforcing the regulations we have in place," a fairly conservative notion. As she notes, EPA enforcement actions are slowing down "in some instances fairly dramatically because they've cut the budget for the number of enforcement agents." You can't do cleanups or police polluters without money and people, both of which Pruitt is looking to cut. Simply put, Pruitt's so-called back-to-basics campaign is a smoke-screen to hide his attempts to gut the Agency he is supposed to lead because it will make his industry backers happy.

Once again, I ask my EPW Republican colleagues: Will you confront Pruitt about his sham promises to get back to basics while he is really just cutting staff and resources and reducing enforcement?

Governor Kean speaks for many Americans when he writes, "For the sake of our children's health, it's time for Scott Pruitt to go." When you are hearing that from the Republican side, it is worth listening.

Pruitt's tenure at the EPA has been an unmitigated disaster for public health, for the environment, and for the future of the planet we call home. Its only value is if you have some peculiar connoisseur interest in government corruption to watch all the many ways in which industry can work its will within its supposed regulator.

Tomorrow, those of us who sit on the Environment and Public Works Committee have an important opportunity to put the Senate's oversight authority to good use and expose how badly Pruitt is in the pocket of the polluters he is supposed to police. I sincerely hope that my Republican colleagues on EPW will seize the opportunity. You can be sure that my Democratic colleagues and I will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today in communities across our country, young people are asking whether they will be able to stay in the only country they have ever called home. Struggling patients and veterans are wondering whether their local community health center will be able to stay open and provide the care that they can't otherwise afford. Workers and business owners are wondering—again—whether the government will even be open in a week or two.

Instead of addressing the serious and pressing challenges that people are facing, Republican leaders today are debating whether to trust women to make their own healthcare choices. That is right. While this country is waiting for us to come together and solve problems, Republicans are wasting precious time with a politically motivated, partisan bill that is engineered to drive us apart and hurt women.

I have come here today to oppose, in the strongest terms, the extreme, ideological abortion ban that Republican leaders have brought to the floor today. It goes against the Constitution, against medical experts, and against the rights of women across the country. However, I don't merely oppose this partisan bill. I oppose the very fact Republicans are once again bringing this bill—which they know is a nonstarter—to the floor.

I oppose the very idea that in the 21st century, we are going to waste time on a question that has already been answered and shouldn't even be up for debate. I oppose the fact that we are still voting on whether women and doctors are best equipped to make healthcare decisions—or politicians here in Washington, DC. We are still voting on whether we should criminalize doctors for making sound medical decisions. We are still voting on whether we should turn back the clock and put women's lives at risk.

Roe v. Wade was decided 45 years ago. We celebrated the anniversary of that historic decision last week. I would like to think that after almost half a century, we could move on from debating this settled issue. Yet here we are.

In 2015, the Republican leaders stated quite flatly that a vote to defund Planned Parenthood would be an exercise in futility because there was no way it was going to pass. The same is true of this extreme, harmful legislation. Yet here we are.

Bringing this bill to the floor is an exercise in futility, and passing it would be an exercise in cruelty. Just look at the story from a Washington State mother, Judy Nicastro. A few years ago, she wrote an op-ed in the New York Times, and she courageously shared a story that is every expecting woman's worst nightmare. Judy shared her experience of learning that one of the twins she was carrying had a lung condition. One lung chamber had not formed at all, and the other was only 20 percent complete. She wrote:

My world stopped. I loved being pregnant with twins. . . . The thought of losing one child was unbearable.

She went on to say:

The MRI at Seattle Children's Hospital confirmed our fears: the organs were pushed up into our boy's chest and not developing properly. We were in the 22nd week.

I am grateful her doctors were able to give her sound medical advice. I am grateful that she and her husband were able to make the decision they felt was best for their own family. And I am so grateful to Judy for sharing her story, which represents the incredibly painful decision she and so many other women have faced.

My colleagues might recognize that story. I have shared it before, just as Republicans have introduced this deeply harmful legislation before. I hope this time the Republicans listen. I hope they will stop trying to pretend they are in any way qualified to interfere with decisions that a woman has the

constitutional right to make on her own. I hope they will stop trying to criminalize a doctor's ability to provide sound medical advice and protect the lives of patients. I hope they will stop wasting our time with bills that are so out of date, extremely out of touch, and obviously unconstitutional.

But if Republicans will not stop this exercise in futility and their attacks on women's rights, they should know that I will not stop standing up and making clear exactly why they are wrong. They should know I am going to keep fighting for Judy and so many other women and their families, and I will keep urging them to work with Democrats on the serious challenges that face our Nation—none of which, by the way, have to do with trusting women or controlling their healthcare choices.

I do want to thank the many Democrats who will be joining me here on the floor to stand up for women and deliver this same message to our Republican colleagues. Again, I hope they listen because Democrats would like to get to work.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to thank the senior Senator from Washington for her leadership on this important issue and for gathering women to come to the floor today to talk about the Republican bill that has been proposed and that we will be voting on soon.

When I was a girl growing up in Oklahoma, women got abortions. Make no mistake, abortions were illegal back then, but women got them. Desperate women turned to back-alley butchers, and some even tried the procedure on their own, using coat hangers or drinking turpentine. Some were lucky, but some weren't. Some women bled to death. Some died of infection. Some were poisoned. And they all went through hell.

In 1973, the Supreme Court stepped in. Forty-five years after *Roe v. Wade*, abortions are safer than getting your tonsils out. A lot of women are alive today because of *Roe*. Nearly 70 percent of Americans agree, *Roe v. Wade* is worth celebrating.

I wish I were here today to acknowledge the impact of *Roe*. Instead, I am here to defend it from attack.

Last week President Trump marked the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* by calling for a ban on a rare category of abortions—ones that take place after 20 weeks of pregnancy. So today, the Senate is voting on a bill to do exactly that.

Let's be honest about why this vote is happening now. Today's vote is happening because politicians who have never been pregnant, who have never had an abortion, who have never had to make a wrenching decision after learning that the child they are carrying will not survive childbirth—those poli-

ticians want to score political points at the expense of women and their families.

We are having this vote today because President Trump asked for it. If it passes, this unconstitutional bill would put women's lives and women's health at risk. Government officials who seek to insert themselves between women and their doctors ought to listen to the women whose lives are on the line and the doctors who care for them. If they were listening right now, we wouldn't be holding this vote.

Only 1 percent of abortions take place at 21 weeks or later, and the reasons are heartbreaking. I have heard from people across Massachusetts who shared their devastating stories. The Senate should hear these stories.

One woman who wrote to me explained that she was ecstatic to have a second child but learned late in her pregnancy that her daughter's brain was severely malformed. She said:

Being a grown woman with a husband and daughter, I never imagined that I would need to [get an abortion]. But when I learned that the baby I was carrying suffered from a set of severe brain malformations, I faced a binary choice for her: peace or life. . . . I am deeply grateful that I was able to give her the gift of peace.

She and her husband did what they thought was best for their baby girl. They got an abortion in the third trimester.

Another couple chose to get an abortion at 22 weeks, after learning that their son's heart would never fully develop. The husband wrote to me:

His pulmonary veins did not connect to his heart in the right place. He had ventricular septal defect, an atrial septal defect . . . and the left side of his heart was smaller than his right. . . . We hoped to be eligible for in-utero heart surgery, but our fetal cardiologists told us that our son's heart could not be fixed. Our little boy—our miracle—wasn't going to make it.

He described their choice as an act of mercy. He said:

My wife and I are both pro-life, and we would never encourage an abortion. [But] there isn't a day that I regret what we did because we both believe our child is watching over us from a safer place. There also isn't a day I wonder who else could possibly understand what we went through. No law can save my child from his complex congenital heart disease, or save my wife from her suffering.

But the bill we are voting on today says that the government should have been part of that decision—no, not just part of that decision. It would have allowed the government to make that decision, instead of leaving the choice to these brokenhearted parents.

The bill we are considering today would ban all abortions after 20 weeks, with only limited exceptions. It would force women to carry an unviable fetus to term. It would force women with severe health complications to stay pregnant until their lives were on the line. Whatever you believe about abortion generally, this legislation is dangerous and cruel.

Devastating fetal abnormalities aren't the only reason women get abor-

tions after 20 weeks. Some women face so many delays when seeking an abortion, like finding a provider, raising money for the procedure, and paying for travel costs—so many delays that a procedure they wanted earlier in pregnancy gets pushed later and later. These logistical hurdles fall hardest on young people, on women of color, and on low-income communities.

What is behind some of these delays? State-level abortion restrictions pushed through by Republican legislatures that close down clinics and make it harder for women to get access to the care they need. You heard that right. Republican-sponsored abortion restrictions push women to have abortions later and later, and today, Republicans in the Senate push a bill to ban late abortions. It is all connected.

This bill is only one part of a broad and sustained assault by Republican politicians on women's rights to make decisions about their own bodies. Through repeated efforts to limit birth control access, to defund Planned Parenthood, and to restrict abortions, Republicans are chipping away at women's health, women's safety, and women's economic independence.

If MITCH MCCONNELL or PAUL RYAN or Donald Trump actually wanted to reduce abortions, they could embrace policies that would lessen the economic pressures of pregnancy and of motherhood. They could act to help pregnant women and their babies access healthcare early and often. They could help young women avoid unwanted pregnancies in the first place.

Instead, they have spent the last year doing exactly the opposite. They have held vote after vote to try to gut the Affordable Care Act and Medicaid, when we should be expanding those programs. Affordable healthcare, accessible contraceptives, and other programs that support working women and families are all under attack. And today, Republican politicians want to distract from their hypocrisy with an unconstitutional 20-week abortion ban—one that will not pass, that ignores the actual experiences of women, and would cause enormous harm if it were signed into law.

Today's vote, which we all know will fail, isn't about policy; it is about political theater. But women don't get abortions to prove a political point. Reproductive rights are about health. They are about safety. And this particular vote about banning abortions at 20 weeks is about a bunch of politicians intruding on one of the most wrenching decisions that a woman will ever make.

It has been 45 years since *Roe v. Wade*; 45 years since women gained the constitutional right to a safe, legal abortion; 45 years since the days of illegal abortions. I have lived in that America. I have lived in the world of back-alley butchers and wrecked lives. And we are not going back—not now, not ever.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I would like to thank my friend Senator MURRAY for organizing this block of time for us—you have just heard from Senator WARREN—and for all the work Senator MURRAY has done to fight for women all across the country.

Today's debate is the latest battle in the continuing assault on a women's constitutionally protected right to an abortion. As decided by the Supreme Court in *Roe* and reaffirmed in *Casey*, the right to an abortion is rooted fundamentally in a women's right to privacy, but the Supreme Court's recognition of this constitutionally protected right has not prevented continuous efforts to limit that right.

I ask my Republican colleagues who are on a mission to limit a woman's constitutional right to choose: What is more private than a person's right to her own body—not just to control her body but to literally own her body? What could be more private than that? That is what is at stake as we debate the bill before us today.

My home State of Hawaii was the first State in the country to legalize abortion, and it continues to be at the forefront of protecting, expanding, and preserving this constitutional right. But for every law we fought to pass, we have had to fight just as hard to beat back a wide range of anti-choice legislation.

Republican-controlled State legislatures have enacted hundreds of limitations on choice. These efforts have not abated in the States or even in Congress. Courts have deemed many of these laws unconstitutional. That is why Donald Trump and the entire conservative movement have prioritized selecting, appointing, and confirming judges who are ideologically sympathetic to their views on choice.

The Trump administration is also eroding this right through Executive action. In one prominent example last year, a senior official at the Department of Health and Human Services went to court to impose his own ideological views to prevent a young woman in his care from obtaining an abortion after forcing her to undergo anti-abortion counseling. Fortunately, the DC Circuit Court stopped this official from forcing this young woman to be pregnant against her will.

The Republican Congress is complicit as well. Over the past 7 years of Republican control, the House and Senate voted to defund Planned Parenthood more than 20 times.

I understand that this is an emotionally charged issue and that each of us has strongly held and sincere positions, but it really shouldn't be too much to ask for my colleagues to stay out of my private life and the private lives of women all across the country. That is called respecting each other's views. Why should we institutionally force other people who do not share your views to basically have to live with

your version of the choices that we all ought to be able to make in our lives?

The bill we are debating today would jeopardize the health and safety of women by establishing a nationwide ban on abortion care after 20 weeks. This bill is arbitrary, and it is not meaningfully different from the Arizona law deemed unconstitutional by the Ninth Circuit in 2014, a case that the Supreme Court let stand.

This bill fails to account for the reasons why a woman might seek an abortion after 20 weeks, and it restricts the ability of women to make the best decisions for themselves and their families.

This bill includes no exception allowing for abortion in the case where the pregnancy is a risk to the woman's health. Instead, a doctor would only be able to provide care after establishing that a woman would die—would die—or suffer life-threatening injuries without an abortion. How cruel can this bill be that the only exception is when a woman is about to die before she can get the care she needs?

To make matters worse, this bill places additional burdens on women who survive the horrors of sexual assault. Under this bill, a sexual assault survivor must provide written proof she had obtained counseling or medical treatment to receive an abortion. However, a woman's own OB/GYN could not provide this counseling if he or she provides abortion services or, even worse, has a practice that provides them.

Adult women who are able to qualify under these outrageous conditions would still have to wait 48 hours before they could receive abortion care.

If the survivor is a minor, the law establishes an additional burden to prove she reported the crime to the authorities. According to the Department of Justice, only 35 percent of women who are raped and sexually assaulted report the crime to the police.

Victims of incest who are over 18 would also not be specifically permitted an exception under this bill.

This legislation would even threaten doctors with fines and/or imprisonment for providing abortion services to women who do not meet the bill's narrow exceptions after 20 weeks.

But the outrage doesn't end there. This bill does not contain an exception for cases where a woman's fetus is not developing properly and has no chance at living after birth. Many of the women in these circumstances desperately wanted the pregnancies they are choosing to terminate.

Last year, I read a moving account from Meredith Isaksen, an English instructor at Berkeley City College, who shared her personal and heartbreaking story in an essay in the *New York Times*.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of her essay be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *New York Times*, Oct. 20, 2016]

LATE-TERM ABORTION WAS THE RIGHT CHOICE FOR ME

(By Meredith Isaksen)

BERKELEY, CA.—I was 21 weeks pregnant when a doctor told my husband and me that our second little boy was missing half his heart. It had stopped growing correctly around five weeks gestation, but the abnormality was not detectable until the 20-week anatomy scan. It was very unlikely that our baby would survive delivery, and if he did, he would ultimately need a heart transplant.

In the days that followed, after the poking and prodding, after the meetings with pediatric cardiologists, cardiothoracic surgeons and geneticists, my husband and I decided to terminate our pregnancy. I was 22 weeks pregnant when they wheeled me into the operating room, two weeks shy of viability in the state of California.

For us, the decision was about compassion for our unborn baby, who would face overwhelming and horribly painful obstacles. Compassion for our 2-year-old son, who would contend with hours upon hours in a hospital, missing out on invaluable time spent with his parents, and the death of a very real sibling. It was about compassion for our marriage. Perhaps most important, it was about our belief that parenthood sometimes means we sacrifice our own dreams so our children don't have to suffer.

As the day of my termination approached and I felt my baby's kicks and wiggles, I simultaneously wanted to crawl out of my skin and suspend us together in time. I wanted him to know how important he was to me, that the well of my grief and love for him would stretch deeper and deeper into the vastness of our family's small yet limitless life. He may have moved inside me for only five months, but he had touched and shaped me in ways I could never have imagined.

To Donald J. Trump and politicians like him, a late-term abortion is the stuff of '80s slasher films. "You can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother," Mr. Trump said during Wednesday night's debate, a description void of consideration for women, medical professionals or the truth. Such politicians would have you believe that women like me shouldn't get to make the choice I made. That our baby, despite his tiny misshapen heart and non-existent aorta, should have a chance "to live," even though that life might have lasted mere minutes. Even though that life would have been excruciatingly painful. These politicians are ignorant of the sacrifices and blessings that come with carrying a pregnancy (let alone a nonviable pregnancy). They do not understand that a majority of women who have late-term abortions are terminating desperately wanted pregnancies.

I am fortunate to live in a state that allows abortions after 20 weeks. At least 13 states restrict such procedures; 15 more have moved to defund Planned Parenthood, where many low-income women go for reproductive care.

Many women have made the kind of difficult decision I had to make. When it happens to you, they come out of the woodwork. Friends, neighbors, colleagues. A friend of my mother-in-law said to me early on, "You will always carry this loss, but someday, it won't define you."

As the two-year anniversary of my abortion approaches, I can say without a shadow of a doubt that we made the right decision for our family—and that our government has absolutely no place in the anguish which accompanies a late-term abortion, except to ensure that women and their families have the right to make their choice safely and privately.

Saying goodbye to our boy was the single most difficult and profound experience of my life, and the truth is, it has come to define me. Today I am a better mother because of him. I am a better wife, daughter and friend. He made me more compassionate and more patient. He taught me to love with reckless abandon, despite the knowledge that I could lose it all.

We named him Lev, the Hebrew word for heart.

Ms. HIRONO. Meredith was 21 weeks pregnant when she learned that her second baby boy was missing half of his heart. It had stopped growing properly at around 5 weeks, but it wasn't detectable until her 20-week anatomy scan. Meredith's decision to terminate her pregnancy was an agonizing one, but as she weighed her options, she reflected on the meaning of compassion, and she said:

For us, the decision was about compassion for our unborn baby, who would face overwhelming and horribly painful obstacles. Compassion for our 2-year-old son, who would contend with hours upon hours in a hospital, missing out on invaluable time spent with his parents, and the death of a very real sibling. It was about compassion for our marriage. Perhaps most important, it was about our belief that parenthood sometimes means we sacrifice our own dreams so our children don't have to suffer.

Meredith asserted—and I agree—that our government has no place in the anguish that accompanied her decision to have an abortion.

Meredith closed her essay with a very poignant reflection on her own experience 2 years later. She wrote:

Saying goodbye to our boy was the single most difficult and profound experience of my life, and the truth is, it has come to define me. Today I am a better mother because of him. I am a better wife, daughter and friend. He made me more compassionate and more patient. He taught me to love with reckless abandon, despite the knowledge that I could lose it all.

Meredith and her husband named him Lev, the Hebrew word for "heart."

Meredith was fortunate in that she lived in a State that permitted abortions past 20 weeks. Thirteen States have established a 20-week abortion ban, and the women living in those States have suffered as a result. Think about all the Merediths in those 13 States and many others.

Recently, I heard from Dr. Ghazaleh Moayed, an OB/GYN who has practiced medicine in Texas, which has a 20-week abortion ban, and in Hawaii, a State that has strong protections for women seeking to exercise their constitutional right to an abortion. Her experience clarifies why it is so urgent that we defeat this bill.

Dr. Moayed shared a story of a young woman in her town who sought medical treatment at a medical provider after her water broke at 22 weeks. This was in Texas. Although she desperately wanted her pregnancy, her fetus was not viable outside the womb. Because of the Texas law, this patient's doctors were unable to counsel her on all medically appropriate options, such as immediate delivery. As she became

increasingly ill, the patient requested an abortion to prevent her condition from getting worse. The doctors on her case refused. After spending 2 weeks in a hospital intensive care unit, this woman was transferred to Dr. Moayed's care, where she ultimately had to have both her hands and feet amputated due to severe infection. She also lost her baby.

Dr. Moayed recently moved from Texas to Hawaii, where she now provides lifesaving abortion care to women at all stages of pregnancy.

Recently, Dr. Moayed had a patient with a desired pregnancy who was flown in from a neighbor island for management of her pre-viable labor. Despite the expert, specialist care she received, the patient's water broke at 22 weeks. At that point, there was nothing Dr. Moayed could do to prevent labor. Because abortion is legal after 20 weeks in Hawaii, Dr. Moayed was able to provide lifesaving abortion care for her patient and prevent her from developing a massive infection.

Dr. Moayed put it plainly in her note: "Restrictions on abortion care endanger the lives of my patients."

"Restrictions on abortion care endanger the lives of my patients." And that is exactly what this bill will do. It will endanger the lives of millions of women in this country who do not—who do not—make the decision to have an abortion after 20 weeks lightly. As my colleague from Massachusetts said, most abortions take place before 20 weeks.

We are passing a cruel, unconscionable, and indeed unconstitutional law. Why are we doing that? Why these continuing attacks on a woman's health, her economic well-being, and her ability to control her own body?

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this unconscionable bill.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I join my colleagues on the floor today to speak in opposition to the pending legislation to outlaw abortion procedures after 20 weeks.

This is yet another extreme effort to allow the government to interfere in the healthcare decisions that should be strictly between a woman and her family and her physician. This latest attempt is particularly dangerous. It would impose prison sentences of up to 5 years on physicians who don't fulfill the law's deliberately burdensome requirements for documentation and reporting, and it would even impose a prison sentence of up to 5 years on doctors who fail to inform a law enforcement agency about another doctor who fails to meet the law's requirements. Viewed more broadly, this bill is part of a continuing campaign to take away women's constitutional right to privacy—a right that protects profoundly personal decisions concerning our bodies and our families.

I remember very well the days prior to 1973, when abortion was outlawed in

most States. An estimated 1.2 million women each year resorted to illegal abortions, typically performed in unsanitary conditions by unlicensed practitioners and often resulting in infection, hemorrhage, and even death. Well, I think women remember those days, and we are not going back.

As Governor of New Hampshire in 1997, I signed into law a bill that repealed our State's archaic law that dated back to 1848 and made abortion a felony. Like that 1848 law, the legislation now before the Senate would also threaten physicians with criminal charges and imprisonment.

Abortion later in pregnancy is extremely rare. Indeed, almost 99 percent of abortions occur before 21 weeks. When an abortion is needed later in pregnancy, it typically involves very complex, life-threatening, and heart-breaking circumstances—for example, the discovery of a severe and likely fatal abnormality, as described by Senator HIRONO. In these difficult circumstances, a woman consults with her doctor and with other people she trusts. A woman needs the freedom to consider every medical option, including serious risks to her own life.

The extremely narrow exceptions in the bill before us—exceptions if the pregnancy results from rape or incest—are deliberately designed to impose burdens, complications, and shame on women who have chosen to terminate a pregnancy. The victim must provide written verification that she has obtained counseling or medical treatment from a very specific list of "medical providers" who do not provide abortions and who are often strongly anti-abortion. This requirement is a completely unnecessary burden on a woman who is already dealing with a crisis. It is also insulting and condescending to all women. We are not children who need guidance from an adult. We can consult those we choose to consult, and we can make our own decisions. To impose this requirement in this crude manner is something right out of a handmaid's tale.

Then, if the rape victim is a minor, she is allowed access to an abortion only if she can provide proof that she reported the crime to law enforcement. Again, this is completely out of touch with the real world. Only a small percentage of sexual assaults and rapes are reported to police. Nearly 80 percent of rape and sexual assault victims know their offender.

So let's say this plainly. The reporting requirements in this bill are an outrageous attempt to judge and shame women and girls who have been victims of a violent crime.

I heard from Rachel, who is a registered, board-certified nurse in New Hampshire. She told me that bills to impose blanket rules and arbitrary limitations—bills like the one before the Senate today—are out of touch with the reality she sees in her practice every day. Rachel said:

While procedures at 20 weeks and beyond certainly comprised a small portion of the

care we provided, it was absolutely critical for those that needed it. Many pregnancies are not surveyed with ultrasound until 19–20 weeks, at which time previously unforeseen complications can be detected. Then, there are often further procedures needed to finalize a diagnosis and a prognosis. For people who receive devastating news about a pregnancy after 20 weeks, abortion may be the best option, and they deserve access to that care.

The American Medical Association opposes this bill. The AMA says: We “strongly condemn any interference by the government or other third parties that causes a physician to compromise his or her medical judgment as to what information or treatment is in the best interest of the patient.”

I urge my colleagues to respect the women of this country and their right to make their own healthcare decisions without the unwelcome involvement of politicians and law enforcement agencies. Let's reject this partisan, extreme, and, frankly, unnecessary legislation today. Then, let's focus our bipartisan attention on the urgent business of passing a budget, funding our military, combating the opioid crisis, and the other needs that this country faces.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, today is a proud day but also a painful one for me. I am proud because I am honored and proud to join my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN, and others on the floor. I was proud to join Connecticut organizations and advocates this morning in Hartford for a rally that involved Planned Parenthood of Southern New England, NARAL Pro-Choice Connecticut, the Women's March of Connecticut, AIDS Connecticut, and the Center for Medicare Advocacy. These groups are proud and steadfast and have strong activists who joined me to support a woman's right to determine her medical future, the right of privacy, and the constitutional right to be left alone, as one of the Supreme Court Justices once called it.

It was a proud moment for me also because it reminded me of my days as a law clerk for Justice Harry Blackmun, who was the author of *Roe v. Wade* and who taught me the constitutional principle that underlies a woman's right to determine her own healthcare decisions.

Harry Blackmun was a Republican appointee. He was a Republican before he became a jurist. But there was nothing partisan for him—and there should be nothing partisan for us—about this decision. I am tempted to call this 20-week abortion ban a Republican proposal, but when I think about the Republicans I know—and especially Justice Harry Blackmun, whom I revered—there is nothing Republican about this proposal. There is nothing partisan about a proposal that seeks to interfere in this fundamental right of privacy. It is an extremist, rightwing

proposal that happens to have been brought here by 46 of our Republican colleagues—all of them men, except two—who are essentially trying to tell the women of America what to do with their own bodies, when to have children or not. That is fundamentally unconstitutional. It flies in the face of *Roe v. Wade* and all of its progeny. It is a restriction that has been struck down when adopted at the State level in at least two courts, and the others that have adopted similar proposals will be struck down, in my view, as well.

The consensus of the medical community, the legal community, and ordinary citizens, particularly women, is that women have reproductive rights that would be violated, dramatically and directly, by this proposal. It violates those rights for totally baseless reasons—policies founded on falsehoods. It is another excuse for right-wing dogma and ideology, out of touch with America, to seek to put opponents at a political disadvantage. It is transparently a political ploy.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists—the doctors who are most qualified to present scientific, evidence-based facts—disagree with the assertions and falsehoods that fetuses can feel pain at 20 weeks. In fact, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists wrote—and I am quoting directly from medical experts on fetal health:

Sound health policy is best based on scientific fact and evidence-based medicine. The best healthcare is provided free of governmental interference in the patient-physician relationship. Personal decision-making by women and their doctors should not be replaced by political ideology.

Worse than the fabrications behind this bill are the very real consequences that will come if it is passed. This nationwide abortion ban would provide virtually no adequate exception when a woman's health is at risk, when there are fetal anomalies or when there are dangers to the health and well-being of a mother who is sick; or if her life is threatened, this bill fails to guarantee that she has access to the healthcare that she needs. If there is a fetal anomaly and a woman learns that her child will be born with significant impairments or, worse yet, a short life filled with pain, it would force her to carry that child to term. If a woman is advised that her child will not survive pregnancy at all, the most personal medical decisions of her life would be usurped by a cruel, heartless, unconscionable, unconstitutional law. She would be deprived of the right to make those decisions with her family, her clergy, her doctors.

The American public disagrees strongly with this potential law, as does the medical community, and individual doctors who have real-life experiences disagree strongly with it as well. One doctor who practices in Connecticut told me that for patients who are treated in that office who choose to get an abortion after 20 weeks, it is of-

tentimes “an agonizing decision, an unexpected one, and too often a lonely one—a decision that is deeply personal and altering.”

For many women, he told me, medical tests show a devastating issue with a future child. “A joyous event becomes a tragic one, as they learn of a lethal condition, or a syndrome that will lead to a brief life of suffering.”

I could quote other doctors. I could quote women who have been through this experience. But without exaggerating, it is one of the most deeply difficult, personal decisions that women have a right to make, without the interference of a politician, an insurance bureaucrat, or anyone else in positions of authority. It is their decision.

Congress must keep its hands off women's healthcare. To my colleagues, keep your hands off of women's healthcare. It is their lives and their well-being and their personal privacy that are at stake.

I am going to continue to fight this ban, painfully, because its consequences would be so cruel, but also because it is certainly not the Republican Party that I know that would advocate for it. It certainly should not be partisan in any way, and it certainly should not even be before us in this great Chamber, which has such respect and such a profound role in our Constitution. To consider violating the Constitution so dramatically is a disservice to this great body.

I yield the floor.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I join many of my colleagues in voicing my strong opposition to S. 2311, the 20-week abortion ban bill. This legislation puts political ideology ahead of women's health and tramples on women's constitutional rights.

First, the 20-week abortion ban intrudes on private healthcare decisions. Reproductive health choices are highly personal and individualized and should be left squarely in the hands of women in consultation with their physician, healthcare team, and loved ones. S. 2311 violates this principle by subjecting private healthcare choices to an arbitrary and unscientific blanket ban.

Second, the 20-week abortion ban violates the longstanding constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy. In 1973, a 7–2 majority of the U.S. Supreme Court held in *Roe v. Wade* that the constitutional right to privacy includes the right to terminate a pregnancy. Since then, the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly rejected bans on abortions before viability, which generally occurs well after 20 weeks of pregnancy. Today, 7 in 10 Americans support upholding *Roe v. Wade*.

A diverse coalition of Americans—including physicians, civil rights advocates, and faith organizations—has come out against this legislation for a number of reasons. The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the American College of

Nurse-Midwives, for instance, have said that the legislation "... would dictate how physicians should care for their patients based on inaccurate and unscientific claims." The American Civil Liberties Union has said this legislation "... directly contradicts longstanding precedent holding that a woman should 'be free from unwarranted governmental intrusion' when deciding whether to continue or terminate a pre-viability pregnancy." And Three dozen faith-based organizations have written in opposition to this legislation, saying, "The proper role of government in the United States is not to privilege one set of religious views over others but to protect each person's right and ability to make decisions according to their own beliefs and values."

We should be working to open up access to reproductive healthcare for more women and families, not fewer. Effective family planning services, including birth control, have a proven record of boosting health and economic mobility while reducing unwanted pregnancies.

The U.S. Senate has urgent priorities to address. We should not be wasting time on another misguided attempt to take away women's healthcare and constitutional rights. I strongly oppose S. 2311.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to express my opposition to the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This blatant attempt to ban later abortion undermines decades of legal precedent and directly challenges the landmark *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court decision. The Supreme Court made clear that women in this country have a constitutional right to autonomy over their individual health and well-being. If passed, this bill would impose burdensome and medically unnecessary limitations on women, particularly those in low-income, medically underserved areas.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that nearly 99 percent of abortions are performed before 21 weeks of pregnancy. Many of the abortions that are performed after 20 weeks are medically necessary because the mother's health is at risk or because of a fetal anomaly. This bill has no exception to protect a woman's health and no exception for cases where there is a fetal anomaly.

This bill harms women who are victims of sexual assault and minors who are the victims of incest. It requires rape victims to provide written proof that the victim obtained counseling or medical treatment from a specified list of locations, and it requires the minor to provide written proof that she reported the crime to law enforcement or a government agency.

These provisions are designed to perpetuate a culture of not believing women and trying to discredit the victims of sexual assault.

To make matters even worse, this bill punishes doctors by threatening

them with 5 years of jail time for violating the ban. This bill, if passed, will take women back to the days of back-alley abortions, where doctors were in fear of providing lifesaving, medically necessary procedures to women and where women were forced to take drastic and dangerous measures in order to have the procedure performed.

Many of my Republican colleagues talk about keeping Big Government out of people's lives, but when it comes to one of the hardest and most intimate decisions a woman can make—a decision that she wishes to make between herself, her family, and her doctor—these same colleagues believe that the government, and not the woman, knows better. They believe that the government, and not the woman, should dictate what a woman should do with her body. They believe that the government should have the power to force a woman to forgo a medically necessary procedure. They believe that a woman should be stripped of that power, stripped of the choice of what is best for herself.

Empowering women is one of the most important things we can do for the future of our country. Core to women's constitutional liberties is autonomy over their own health and well-being. In order to truly support women, we need to safeguard and improve, not limit, access to comprehensive healthcare, including abortion.

For all of these reasons, I will be opposing S. 2311.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, as we vote this evening on the Pain-Capable Child Protection Act, I speak to the bill as a doctor who practiced in a hospital for the uninsured for decades. I mention working in a hospital for the uninsured because the uninsured are vulnerable, but if the uninsured are vulnerable, among those, the uninsured pregnant woman is particularly vulnerable. If we are to say she is particularly vulnerable, then we can say her unborn child is most vulnerable of all. So I speak to these folks with that background.

Our country has struggled to find a balance between those of us who are pro-life and those who are pro-choice. As a pro-life doctor, I think the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act strikes a balance. Again, as a physician, let me say it is an obligation—our society's obligation—to care for the woman who is pregnant. Again, she is among the most vulnerable. Her child is the future of our society.

We all agree to this. You can see we agree because our social programs provide a safety net both for her and her unborn child. Example: Society pays for well-baby visits through Medicaid or through special programs for women if they are uninsured. If that child is born healthy, then he or she is more likely to be a healthy person, to contribute to society, to have life, liberty, and be able to pursue happiness.

Those of us who are pro-life and pro-choice can differ when the child within the womb deserves protection as a distinct human, but society has agreed at some point that protection is allowed. Again, I am pro-life. I think the protection should be when the child is conceived, but right now the law is divided.

If a pregnant woman and her child were killed by a reckless driver, there are two counts of manslaughter filed against that reckless driver—one way society acknowledges the life within the womb.

On one hand, let's be clear, a woman has the right to terminate that pregnancy at another point in the pregnancy. On the other hand, partial-birth abortion says that child's life cannot be terminated when she is coming through the birth canal. I think the rationale for this is that as a child comes through the birth canal, we recognize that child can live independently, if allowed to proceed. If you will, the criteria is: Does the child have the ability to live independently from the mother? Again, I think that is the rationale for the partial-birth abortion ban.

As it turns out, a child who is 5 months old within the womb has the ability to live independently. Again, I speak as a physician. When you see a baby in the womb at 5 months, it is incredible.

A friend of mine who works for me—actually, he and his wife are expecting now, and they are excited. They went and got the ultrasound, and they saw the child sucking on his thumb or her thumb—they don't know or they don't want to know. Nonetheless, it is marvelous what they see inside—the child. You can see him yawning, stretching. At 18 weeks, you can find out if it is a boy or a girl—and, thanks to modern medicine and the amazing neonatal intensive care doctors and nurses we have in this country, babies delivered as early as 20 to 22 weeks can survive and live healthy lives, perhaps one day to become the Presiding Officer in the Senate of the United States.

In recent years, medical research has shown that unborn children can feel pain as early as 20 weeks after they are conceived. As a doctor, I have to look at the scientific evidence we have when it comes to the beginning of life. At 20 weeks, studies have provided strong evidence that babies can feel pain despite the fact that the nerve connections between the different parts of the brain are still developing. That is why fetal anesthesia is routinely administered when unborn children require surgery in the womb.

By the way, doctors know this. I just got a letter from the Louisiana Academy of Family Physicians. One of their folks, Dr. Gravois, called me last night. Here is a statement from their letter:

Representing more than 1,900 physicians, including active practicing physicians, residents in training and medical student members, as well as the patients in Louisiana, the Louisiana Academy of Family physicians

is the voice of family medicine in Louisiana. As advocates for our patients, in August of 2015, the LAFP Congress of Delegates passed the following resolution on Late Term Abortions:

Resolved, that the LAFP is against performing elective abortions 20 weeks and after, and further be it Resolved . . .

It goes on, but that is the take-home point. Family physicians take care of both the mother and her child, the totality of it.

By the way, I will say this bill includes explicit—explicit—exceptions when a mother's life is at risk or in cases of rape and incest, again, attempting to strike society's balance between those of us who are pro-life and those who are pro-choice.

Versions of this law have already been passed in 20 States, including my State of Louisiana, but all babies who feel pain deserve the same protection. Most Americans agree, even some who believe abortion should be legal. Polls show that majorities of women, Independents, and Democrats support this protection. So I hope my colleagues will join in supporting this commonsense, humane legislation.

It is estimated this bill will protect 12,000 to 18,000 babies per year. Protecting unborn babies who can feel pain is the right thing to do. Protecting their right to life is the right thing to do.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I am grateful for the comments the Senator from Louisiana just shared. He is a physician. I am not a physician. I am a chemical engineer, and I believe it is important, as the Senator from Louisiana believes, that we look at science when we have this debate about abortion.

Our Nation loses anywhere between 13,000 and 18,000 children a year to late-term abortion. The numbers of children aborted overall are well over 600,000. The focus on the debate today and on the vote coming up this evening is on late-term abortion.

I remember a few months ago having a discussion with a young man, a father of several children, about abortion. We were just two guys chatting, having a snack in the kitchen. He brought up a question—he didn't come from a pro-life perspective—and he asked my views.

He said: Let me ask you a question. At what point should an abortion be legal? We took it out to the very end of gestation. If the baby is literally ready to be delivered, should an abortion be allowed at that moment? He said: Of course not.

OK. Well, let's back it up a day. What about if you are 8 months and 28 days, should abortion be allowed in that situation? Well, of course not. That is way too close to the actual date of giving birth.

So we kind of moved upstream toward conception. So where do you draw the line?

I believe that life begins at conception because that is that magical moment when a life begins, when unique DNA is created, but I realize it is a very contentious issue in our Nation. So one line we can draw is at 20 weeks, and I will talk about why I think 20 weeks is a place we can start to get bipartisan support to stop late-term abortions.

In fact, this young man I was chatting with teared up, and he said: STEVE, you realize that when we were pregnant with one of our daughters—they have five children—at about 10 or 12 weeks they had a test run because it looked like there may be an abnormality in the baby and the doctor recommended an abortion.

He said: What is the alternative? We can wait a few more weeks, when we have a better idea of what is going on there with that little baby, but it puts the mother at perhaps a greater risk.

They decided to wait a few more weeks. A few weeks later when they came back with the test, the baby came back clear, and they now have a healthy, beautiful young girl who is 5 years old. With tears in his eyes, he said: I am so glad we chose not to abort; that we chose life.

At 20 weeks, babies have 10 fingers and 10 toes. They can suck their thumb. They can yawn. They can stretch. They can make faces. Science also shows these babies are capable of feeling pain.

I became a first-time dad 28 years ago. I still remember taking David to his first well-baby appointment, when Cindy and I would go to the pediatrician and get those well-baby checks. When they would give them shots—I think the hardest part as a parent is to see that nurse or doctor give a shot to your little one. Those cries of pain were excruciating for Cindy and for me. He doesn't remember it. We remember it. It may indeed hurt us more than it hurt him at the time, but he felt pain.

My heart breaks for those thousands of babies who are able to feel pain as they are losing their life to abortion. Our ears may be deaf to their cries physically, but we don't have to live in ignorance, not when research, not when the science, not when common sense shows that these unborn children can feel pain.

There is a reason unborn babies are given anesthesia with fetal surgery. That is why we must pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. It is unconscionable as a nation we are allowing unborn children as old as 20 weeks—5 months—well beyond halfway of the 9-month gestation period—that we allow them to be killed today in this country.

In fact, do a Google search for “20 weeks.” You don't have to type in “baby.” Just type in “20 weeks.” If you are watching this and have a smartphone, a computer, type in “20

weeks” in the Google search bar there and hit search or enter. Then, take a look at the pictures that come up that match the simple term “20 weeks.” This is one of the pictures you will see when you Google that.

I believe there is a principle that people believe what they discover for themselves. What is happening right now is—because of technology, because of the precision and the clarity of ultrasounds today, what we can see now in the womb is incredible. It is no wonder the attitudes of millennials—those ages 18 to 24—in the last 6 years are becoming increasingly more pro-life, in fact up 9 points, from 44 percent to 53 percent. I think part of the reason is in the hands of their smartphone. When you take a look at the images, how can you say that is not a baby? That is a 20-week baby. We are on a horrible list of just seven countries that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks. China and North Korea join the United States on that list.

Before I got involved in politics and public service, I worked in the private sector for 28 years. One of the companies I worked for was Procter & Gamble. While at Procter & Gamble, I was asked to go to China to help launch operations there to produce and sell products, Americans brands, to the Chinese consumer.

I had a large operation. One day, one of my managers—a young man, Chinese, wonderful, very bright, very capable, one of our future stars. He and his wife were both P&G employees, both Chinese.

He said: STEVE, I need to go to the police station this afternoon. I said: Well, is there something wrong? He goes: Well, no. It is going to be OK. Then he kind of looked away.

I said: But you are asking for time off of work to go to the police station. Is there something I can help you with or is there something wrong?

He said: Well, my wife and I did not have permission from the police to get pregnant—with the one-child policy then.

He said: We just discovered that she is pregnant.

I said: Well, do you want to keep the baby?

He said: Oh, we want to keep that baby. We are very excited about it. But we won't be allowed to keep that baby.

I said: What can I do?

At this moment, we were focused on saving that baby.

He said to me: What might help is a case of shampoo.

We were there producing brands like Pantene, Vidal Sassoon, Crest toothpaste, Tide detergent. I arranged to get a case of shampoo and gave it to him.

He came back the next day, with a smile on his face, and said: We got the problem resolved.

They became parents of a beautiful little girl who today is an amazing young woman.

As an American citizen, I believe in our founding principle that all men and

women are endowed by their Creator—with a capital “C”—with certain unalienable rights, and among those are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As a person of faith, I believe—and those who are people of faith—we are called to help the most vulnerable in our society. As a Senator, it is my honor to support this legislation, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I thank my colleague Senator JAMES LANKFORD of Oklahoma for his leadership on this issue. I urge the rest of my colleagues to join us in standing up and protecting those who do not have a voice on the floor of the U.S. Senate this afternoon and join us in protecting human life.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, as we consider this legislation to protect 20-week-old babies who feel pain, I want to ask my friends in this body to put aside whip counts and score cards, politics and reelection, and let's talk today simply about beauty and about science.

We love beauty. Beauty calls us. Beauty inspires us. Beauty captivates us. It is part of what makes us human. It is not surprising that there is almost nothing more universal on this Earth, almost nothing more beautiful, than our natural impulse to care for a little baby.

We all start in the same place—vulnerable and dependent in every way. We all “ooh” and “aah” over sonogram pictures of our children, our grandchildren, our nieces, our nephews, even sonogram pictures from a stranger on a bus or a plane. We all “ooh” and “aah” in the same way. When we look at those pictures, we love. We love. You don't have to be taught this. You don't have to be conditioned to love. You don't have to be conditioned to know that we should help the vulnerable. This isn't because of economics. This isn't because of politics. We love because they are babies. You don't need anyone to explain this to you. Every one of us has experienced this when we have seen the sonogram pictures. We should note that this love is not just a feeling; it is also built on and backed up by facts.

As we consider whether these unborn babies—having been carried by their mamas for almost 5 months—deserve legal protection, whether they deserve our protection, we should think, too, about the science and what is becoming clearer year by year and month by month.

I want to associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Montana who preceded me. A huge part of why the millennials are becoming more pro-life than the two generations older than they are is because they are seeing these sonogram images, and it is changing them year by year and month by month.

I have been on the floor for about 45 minutes today, and I have heard many

claims about polling and facts that just aren't true. I am not here to argue this case and argue how we should vote on this legislation because of polls; I am here because we should all love babies. That is why we should be doing this. But just at the level of polling, there have been claims on the floor today that are absolutely not true.

Younger people are becoming more pro-life, as the Senator from Montana said, year over year right now, and it is because of the prevalence and the pervasiveness of sonogram technology. This movement, the pro-life movement, is ascendant, and it is because people are grappling with science, grappling with images, and grappling with the reality of that intrinsic feeling we have to love.

We can and we should appeal to ethics. We can and we should discuss human dignity. We should reaffirm intrinsic value. For now, for this conversation today, we can limit ourselves to just scientific facts. As we consider those facts, I want to respectfully ask my colleagues in this Chamber today, where will we draw the line? No one seriously disputes that the little girl in that image is alive. No one seriously disputes that that little girl is a human being—no one. There is no one in this Chamber and there is no one outside this Chamber who has ever looked at that sonogram image who will come to the floor and say: Do you know the debate I want to have? I want to say that baby is not alive and she is not a human.

Somebody who is going to vote no on the legislation today should come to the floor and make that case, say that is not a life and that is not a human, because it is not true, and no one believes it.

The science is clear. We all know and understand that little baby in that sonogram image is a unique and separate being. We know she has unique DNA from her mother, and she has DNA that is unique from her father. The baby apps are now telling new moms and dads-to-be when that baby is the size of a sesame seed, then a blueberry, and then an apple. With the help of the sonograms, we are now catching pictures of her sucking her thumb, flexing her arms and legs, yawning, stretching, making faces. Here is what is really new the last couple of years: We are catching pictures and images of her responding to voices—familiar voices of other human beings that she is already in community with, people who are called to love her.

As early as 20 weeks postfertilization, which is about halfway through the pregnancy, scientists and our doctors now tell us that this unborn baby can feel pain. In fact, it has become routine procedure of late for us to give unborn and premature infants anesthesia for their fetal surgeries. Why? This is new. We didn't used to do this. Why do we do it? It is because we have new scientific evidence that they feel pain. It turns out

that babies who are 20 weeks along in gestation are pain-capable inside mom's uterus.

As Dr. Kanwaljeet Anand testified before the Congress, “The human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by the fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns.”

Not only can she feel pain, not only do the images show us that she recoils from being poked or prodded, advances in modern medicine are now helping babies who are born at 22 weeks, at 21 weeks, and at 20 weeks postfertilization survive outside the womb. The pain that those babies feel outside the womb is supporting the evidence that those babies also feel pain inside the womb, which leads me to ask my friends: Have our hearts grown cold to truth? Have we become indifferent to questioning our previously held convictions? Are we indifferent to what the science is clearly showing us?

This body, captive to abortion zealot-activists, might be ignoring the sonograms. That might be what is happening in this body today, but the American people are actually listening to the science and the sonograms. Contrary to those bizarre claims that were made on the floor a couple of times over the last hour, a hefty majority—it is not close—of Americans support this legislation, including a supermajority of women, including most young people, including most Independents, and now ticking up just shy of half of all Democrats. This should not be a partisan issue, and in the future, it will not be because more and more people are looking at these images. It is not going to be a partisan issue; it is going to be a bipartisan issue. But you have to tell the truth—that those pictures are pictures of babies, and they are alive, and they deserve our protection. But have our hearts in this body grown cold to the truth?

We should also not forget the mothers because the pro-life message is about being both pro-baby and pro-mother. Late-term abortions are actually not safe, even for the mother. Women seeking abortion after 20 weeks are 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than when done in the first trimester—35 times more likely.

The United States is one of only seven countries on Earth that allow elective abortion after 20 weeks, and we are actually tied with only three other countries as having the most permissive abortion regime on Earth. Do you know who our peers are? North Korea and China. That is who our peers are. If our rhetoric about human rights should mean anything, it should mean we don't want to be on a “human rights worst” list with North Korea and China. That is where we are today.

There are many reasonable people who are going to argue against this legislation. They are reasonable in other ways in life, and they want to make an argument about the very complicated issues about abortion in the

first trimester. There are many reasonable people who can have a reasonable debate about that. But when you listen to the arguments being made today, they are not actually grappling with today's legislation; they are talking about abortion in general. But nobody is telling us why we are tied with only China and North Korea as having the most permissive abortion regime on Earth.

My friends, beauty and compassion can stir our hearts, and science and facts should still confirm the truth. This legislation—the actual legislation we are voting on today—is pro-baby, it is pro-mom, and it is pro-science. These little babies, who are capable of feeling pain, deserve legal protection. They deserve our protection. I invite—I beg my colleagues to join in that conviction and to vote yes on this legislation today.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to join so many of my colleagues to speak in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I thank Senator GRAHAM for his continued leadership on this issue. I supported this bill when Senator GRAHAM introduced it last Congress, and I am pleased Leader MCCONNELL has brought this to a vote.

Regulating abortion after 20 weeks of conception—when a child can feel pain—is a prudent measure that reflects the basic decency of our humanity and brings us in line with most of the Western world.

Science demonstrates that human life begins at conception, and our understanding of neonatal development is increasing by the day.

As a member of the Labor-HHS subcommittee on Appropriations, I have championed funding for the National Institute of Health. At the NIH, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development has advanced our knowledge of pregnancy and development in the womb. Under this institute, the Neonatal Research Network has pioneered research that has led to techniques that save the lives of children in their earliest stages, when these children are at their most vulnerable.

Such research tells us children who are 20 weeks old—those this bill will protect—experience what a newborn will: reacting to noise, sucking their thumbs, and, as this bill's title indicates, feeling pain. The research has led to advancements in medical care for premature babies, and 23 percent of those delivered 20 weeks after fertilization can now survive long term outside of the womb. This percentage will surely increase as advances in neonatal care continue.

Despite what we know, the United States is one of only seven countries in the world, among nations such as China and Vietnam, that permits elective abortion after 20 weeks. As a result, the Congressional Budget Office estimates more than 10,000 babies are aborted each year after 20 weeks of conception.

What we can't lose sight of as a society is that, when we are talking about abortion, we are talking about the end of the most defenseless of human lives. This is true at all stages of pregnancy, regardless of whether it is early in the pregnancy or in the late stages, when children are more developed and more capable of surviving outside of the womb.

So often we turn to scientific evidence and research to support the need for new policies. In this case, the research shows that these children have a chance to survive, a chance to grow. They can feel; they can move. We cannot ignore these reactions and feelings, which are indicative of human life and with them comes the need for legal protections—protections we would not hesitate to provide for those living outside the womb.

Indeed, we have laws that treat animals more humanely than unborn children. This vote gives the Senate an opportunity to send a message showing who we are as leaders and as a society as a whole, one that protects the weak and the voiceless, instead of one that permits their destruction.

One in five children who are born at this 20-week stage are capable of surviving with suitable care. Rather than be discarded, they are to be given every opportunity to fight for the life that we protect for them. It is what we instinctively do as parents and as human beings.

We recoil when we hear of children who are harmed in any manner; yet the ability to terminate an unborn child's life when it is viable outside of the womb is something that is not only tolerated, but passionately defended. If there was anything else claiming the lives of 10,000 children each year, all 100 of us in the Senate would be standing up demanding action to address the matter.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a sensible measure that protects the lives of women and children in accord with judicial rulings. It has been passed by the House of Representatives, it has the support of a majority of Americans—men and women alike—and I call on my colleagues to support passage of this life-affirming legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF DAVID STRAS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I rise today to strongly support an important nomination and also to tell you my position on the legislation before the U.S. Senate right now, the one Senator SASSE has just spoken eloquently about.

First, I strongly support the nomination of Minnesota's Supreme Court Justice David Stras to serve as a circuit judge on the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. Second, I strongly support the passage of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I will briefly address both of these issues.

Over the next couple of days, the Senate will vote on whether to invoke cloture and then confirm the nomination of Justice David Stras to serve on the Eighth Circuit. Justice Stras is eminently qualified and exceptionally bright. He has received praise and support from the legal profession and across the political spectrum.

Justice Stras is the grandson of a Holocaust survivor. He graduated No. 1 in his class from Kansas School of Law in 1999. He served as a law clerk to two Federal circuit judges and to a Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court. Justice Stras has served on the Minnesota Supreme Court since his appointment in 2010. In 2012, he ran for a full 6-year term. He handily defeated his opponent, winning 56 percent of the vote.

Justice Stras has received wide bipartisan support from the Minnesota legal community. He has taught law for many years at the University of Minnesota. He also teaches law at the University of Iowa, which is in my home State. Many of the faculty, including even liberal professors, such as Professor Shelly Kurtz, strongly endorse Justice Stras's nomination. His time in the private sector was spent at two highly regarded law firms.

During his service on the Minnesota Supreme Court, Justice Stras has participated in over 750 cases. As my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR noted, Justice Stras's judicial record demonstrates that he is impartial and apolitical in his writings. Justice Stras has sided with the Minnesota Supreme Court majority 94 percent of the time. Justice Stras has dissented one-third of the time with then-Justice Alan Page, who was the first African-American justice in Minnesota and has a record of being very liberal. Former Justice Page strongly endorses Justice Stras's nomination to the Eighth Circuit, and four former justices from all political stripes also endorsed Justice Stras's nomination. This shows me that Justice Stras will not be a rubberstamp for any political ideology. I am convinced Justice Stras will rule fairly and impartially, finding and applying the law as written, not legislating from the bench.

Justice Stras is a very accomplished and impressive nominee. He has a long judicial record of impartiality. I strongly support his nomination, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Madam President, I also come to the floor to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This common-sense bill recognizes that the government has an interest in protecting our children from the excruciating pain they are capable of experiencing during late-term abortions. This is a bill many Americans, including a majority of women, broadly support, and it is time we get this bill passed.

As the Judiciary Committee chairman, I convened a hearing on this bill in 2016. Three witnesses, including a

Northwestern professor of pediatrics, a woman who survived a botched abortion as a baby, and a former abortion provider, offered compelling evidence in support of this very important legislation.

There is also the history of an Iowa boy, Micah Pickering, who is living proof that we need to do more to protect unborn babies at this stage of development. Micah and his parents visited me in Washington last September. They told me that when Micah was born at 20 weeks postfertilization, he received intensive care, including medication to minimize his pain and discomfort. Babies like Micah, born in the fifth month of pregnancy, are capable of feeling such pain. That is why it has now become routine procedure to give premature infants anesthesia for fetal surgeries.

How could anyone think these unborn babies would not experience the same excruciating pain from abortions when premature babies like Micah, from Iowa, are being born at the same stage of development and are surviving late term?

Once again, I call upon my colleagues to support the passage of this bill, entitled the "Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act," and to embrace at the same time the sanctity of an innocent human life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I join Senator GRASSLEY and my colleagues in supporting the bill before us today.

As we debate this issue, it always seems to be such a defining issue in terms of who we are and whom we hope to be. No country in Europe allows a pregnancy to be ended this late in the pregnancy. No country in Africa allows a pregnancy to be ended this late in the pregnancy. Only six other countries in the world allow pregnancies to be ended at any time. As I have listened to the debate today, the debate about 20 weeks, it sounds to me like it wouldn't matter to the opponents of the bill if it were at 30 weeks, certainly, or at 21 weeks or at 20. There is no week one can pass here.

The other bill we should vote on, which the House has passed, is the born-alive bill. There are people in the country today who actually oppose the born-alive bill. When a baby during an abortion process is born alive, my understanding is, you can't step in and take the life of that living child, but you can all step back from the table, on which that baby lies in front of you, and let the baby die.

Obviously, there is a point at which we are not going to be able to talk to each other in a way that apparently will persuade anybody. Maybe hearts will not change, and maybe minds will not change in the Senate today, but as many of my colleagues have pointed out, they are changing in the country. People realize there is a time when that child has every opportunity, with

a little help, to live independently. That, surely, would be too late to end that life in the minds of most people. In the minds of younger people? It is more of the view of older people that life should be saved, but 63 percent of all Americans say we shouldn't continue to allow this to happen.

Senator GRASSLEY just said and others have said a majority of women, a majority of Democrats, a majority of Republicans, a majority of young people all believe this is not an acceptable place for us to be. Why would we want to be one of seven countries in the world that would allow abortion at any time? Why would we want to be one of four countries in the world that would allow abortions at a time when it is widely accepted that the child being aborted—the life being taken—is a child who can feel pain?

As we come to this point today—and while a majority of Senators, I think, will vote for this, though not a big enough majority to put it on the President's desk—I think, once again, we have to ask ourselves: At what point do our friends on the other side, who clearly disagree with us on this issue, feel a life is clearly a life that should be saved? Would you vote for the born-alive bill? Would you vote for this bill if it were at 25 weeks? Would you vote for this bill if it were at 28 weeks? I don't hear any of that in the debate. It is just: This is not the government's business. At some point, it is the government's business. Protecting life is at some point the government's business.

When the Presiding Officer and at least one other person and I served in the House, we changed the law. It was Laci and Conner's Law. When a homicide is committed and the woman is pregnant and the child is lost also, that is considered in law as a double homicide—two lives having been taken at that point, two lives at 20 weeks or at 12 weeks or at 15 weeks. I am not sure where that threshold begins, but I do know we have decided this is not just one crime; that it is two crimes when that happens.

We have an opportunity today to define something that is pretty clearly and significantly defining as to who we are as a nation. Otherwise, virtually every country in the world wouldn't have stopped doing this, if it ever had allowed it to happen in the first place.

I urge my colleagues to join in passing this bill—in standing up for those who cannot defend themselves—and to understand that harm is done, and when harm is done in this way, our society is harmed by that harm.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). The Senator from Mississippi. Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has generously allowed me to intrude on her time for a half a minute to say that I strongly support this legislation—the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Science is on our side in supporting this legislation, and public opinion is

on our side in supporting this legislation. There are 60 percent of women, 64 percent of Independents, and 56 percent of Democrats who support ending late-term abortions, which is what we are trying to do. Medical practice is on our side in this legislation, and world opinion and world practice are on our side.

Let me simply reiterate that we in America are among a grim group of seven countries who permit abortions after 20 weeks—Canada and the Netherlands in the West and then China, North Korea, Singapore, and Vietnam. We are in a grim group that includes North Korea and China. We may not have the votes this time, but we are advancing the issue, and we are going to continue to fight for the unborn, particularly those who are capable of feeling pain after 20 weeks.

I thank the Senate for its time, and I particularly thank the Senator from Nebraska for indulging me for a moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, over my time in public service, I have been committed to supporting common-sense, pro-life measures that offer empathy for women and for unborn children. Too often, women experience despair and pain and judgment from others during unplanned pregnancies. We should offer compassion for these expectant mothers, and they need to know we will continue to support them in the challenging years ahead. We should also be willing to protect the most innocent among us, the unborn, who can feel pain and have the chance at viability.

I rise to discuss the bill that the Senate will consider shortly—the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

This is a reasonable bill that has the support of 47 Senators. This kind of legislation has passed in many States, including in my own. My State of Nebraska has a proud tradition of being pro-life. We were the first State in the country to pass a 20-week abortion ban. The bill before us today would enact the same policy at the Federal level, and doing so makes sense.

As a State senator, I was a strong supporter and cosponsor of that legislation. It passed in Nebraska because we focused on areas of agreement, and like the bill we are debating today, the legislation provided exceptions for rare and dangerous circumstances. This bill passed overwhelmingly in Nebraska by a vote of 44 to 5, and it had the support from pro-choice and pro-life senators from both parties—Republicans and Democrats.

The enduring support for this kind of legislation across the country and the world is pretty easy to understand, in that it is a righteous cause that is based on science. It states that abortions during the sixth month of pregnancy should only be allowed in moments of extreme danger and with exceptions.

Basic embryology shows that the human nervous system is developed within the first 6 weeks of pregnancy. Our sensory receptors for pain are developed around the mouth as early as 10 weeks and are present in the skin and mucosal surfaces 20 weeks into gestation. The connections between the spinal cord and the thalamus—the part of the human body that deals with pain perception—is present at 20-weeks' gestation as well. None of this is debatable. It is a fact.

We also know babies have been born and have survived and thrived before the current 24-week limit. In March of 2017, the academic journal *Pediatrics* discussed a girl in Dallas who, in 2014, was born at 21-weeks' gestation. Today, she is a typical, happy 3-year-old who is living her life to the fullest and has a bright future ahead of her.

Over time, views on this divisive issue have evolved toward the side of pro-life policies because, as we gain more knowledge about pregnancy and gestation, we understand the humanity of the unborn. We recognize them as the people they are—and this movement is on the rise. Nearly two-thirds of Americans support legislation prohibiting abortion into the sixth month of pregnancy. This includes almost 80 percent of the millennial generation—those most likely to be affected by such restrictions. It is gaining momentum because it is a movement backed by science. It is a movement of truth, and it is a movement of love.

We have an opportunity to join together and support the basic truth that all life is sacred. We should protect the child in the womb, especially when he or she can feel pain. We can make a statement that every person is deserving of life and deserving of love.

I believe that life is a gift from God—a gift to be lovingly cherished. I ask my colleagues to support this reasonable piece of legislation.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, in the last few years, I have watched attempt after attempt to restrict a woman's right to choose. This legislation bans a woman's access to abortion after 20 weeks of pregnancy, regardless of the risk to her health, and it weakens the protections for women who are victims of rape and incest. It would also allow for criminal prosecution of doctors and nurses who provide healthcare to a woman in these most difficult circumstances.

For years we have seen politicians at the Federal and State levels push to limit a woman's access to reproductive healthcare. The goal is to completely eviscerate this right. From 2010 to 2016, States adopted 334 restrictions on women's access to comprehensive reproductive healthcare. These include laws that require mandatory waiting periods which have no medical basis, force doctors to give patients inac-

curate medical information, and restrict access to contraceptives.

In just 1 year, the Trump administration has attempted to restrict women's access to birth control, attempted to defund Planned Parenthood, supported legislation to dismantle the Affordable Care Act and its protections for women's health, created new government offices to undermine women's healthcare, and nominated judges who openly oppose women's privacy rights under *Roe v. Wade*.

This bill is yet another attempt to harm women by criminalizing their healthcare, even threatening the doctors who care for them with years in prison.

Think of a pregnant woman who is planning for her family's future, and then something goes terribly wrong. She is experiencing a miscarriage. This happens to women every day. It is not just scary medically, it is extremely painful and emotional. Under this bill, a woman's health is put at risk, and her doctor could be threatened with criminal prosecution. If a woman's miscarriage hasn't completed, her health could rapidly deteriorate from fever and infection. If this bill passes and a woman goes to the hospital, no doctor could help her. Because under this legislation, there is no exception to protect a woman's health. None.

Only if a doctor can be certain that a woman is close to death could they legally intervene, and that I think is unconscionable.

I have heard from women in California who were thrilled to be pregnant, only to receive the devastating news that their babies had fatal anomalies and would not survive. Let me give you an example. Rosalie, from Northern California, wrote to me and stated:

Our baby's heart was severely deformed. He was missing parts of his brain, and his lungs likely would not have supported him breathing on his own, ever.

We found all of this out at 19.5 weeks. . . . If we were a few days late under this bill, we would have been forced to carry our baby to term only to have him suffer for a few minutes, days, weeks, and then die.

Families dealing with situations like Rosalie's deserve compassion and support for this heart-wrenching situation. But instead, this legislation leaves them with no options.

Last Congress, at a Judiciary Committee hearing, we heard from Christy Zink, who learned late in her pregnancy that her baby was missing the central connecting structure of the two parts of his brain. She told us in public testimony:

At no point in this decision and the resulting medical care would the sort of political interference under consideration have helped me or my family.

What happened to me during pregnancy can happen to any woman.

This bill is not only harmful to women like Rosalie and Christy, but it is unconstitutional, and it violates *Roe v. Wade*. Look at the challenges to two States that enacted 20-week bans—Ari-

zona and Idaho. Both were struck down at the circuit court level as unconstitutional.

Let me read that again. Two States, Arizona and Idaho, with this legislation—it was struck down at the circuit court level as unconstitutional. The Supreme Court refused to review Arizona's case. Idaho didn't appeal.

It is also important to point out that this bill weakens protections for women who have been victims of rape or incest. Rape victims would no longer be able to access healthcare unless they could show proof that they received medical treatment or counseling for the rape or reported the assault to law enforcement. I find this shocking.

Think of a young girl who is a victim of sex trafficking. She is beaten, imprisoned, and raped by multiple men each night. She gets pregnant. This law would require this rape victim to go to law enforcement or a government official to access medical care. These girls don't have control over their own bodies. They have no freedom. To deny medical care to rape and incest victims because they don't have the right paperwork or have not reported their assault to police is unworkable and, I believe, cruel.

It is deeply troubling that we are using valuable floor time for this dangerous bill. The current funding bill expires in 10 days, and we still don't have a legislative solution for Dreamers. That is what we should be taking up right now. Instead, Republicans have chosen to spend the Senate's time trying to turn back the clock, debating on legislation that would drive us back to pre-*Roe v. Wade*.

I remember those days. I know what it was like. We knew then and we still know today that banning abortion does not end it; it just means that women undergo unsafe procedures, and lives are lost.

It is 2018. Women are more than half the population of this country. We run Fortune 500 companies. We are leaders in government. We are the heads of households. The Constitution of the United States guarantees our right to privacy and our right to access to reproductive healthcare. I, for one, will not see these rights stripped away.

Thank you very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to thank all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle who have joined in this debate and are having their voices heard. You are on the right side of history. You are where America will be. It is just a matter of time until we get there.

To my colleagues on the other side, I appreciate your passion, but I think you are on the wrong side of history.

What we are trying to do here today is to proceed to a bill. It is called a motion to proceed. But I think what we are trying to do is proceed to a better America. We are one of seven nations on the entire planet to allow abortion on demand after 20 weeks; that is, the fifth month of pregnancy.

What do we know about unborn children at that stage of development? We know that for a doctor to operate on that unborn child, they provide anesthesia because it hurts the child, and no doctor wants to hurt the child in an effort to save the child's life. Listen to what I said. Medical practice dictates that if you are going to operate on a 20-week-old, unborn child, you provide anesthesia because science tells us that the baby can feel pain.

Can you only imagine the pain it will feel from abortion? There is a reason that there are only seven countries in the world that allow this. The question for America is, Do we want to stay in this club or do we want to get out? I want out.

Twenty States have a version of this bill, and more are taking it up as I speak. When informed of what we are trying to do, the majority of pro-choice people support this. Abortion is a divisive issue, and it is an emotional issue, but in the fifth month of pregnancy, I think most Americans are going to side with what we are trying to do—stopping abortion on demand in the fifth month.

Does it make us a better nation? I would say it does not.

So we are trying to proceed to make sure that America will be a better place and that we become part of the mainstream of the world when it comes to protecting unborn children after the fifth month of pregnancy.

If you look at a medical encyclopedia and read about the birthing process, parents are encouraged in the fifth month to sing to a child because the child will begin to associate your voice with you. Read it. There is literature of all kinds stating what you should do in the fifth month to enhance the relationship between you and your unborn child.

We do allow exceptions to save the life of the mother. It is a terrible situation when we have to pick between the mother and child, and there is an exception for that situation. The result of rape or incest if the child was a minor—when it comes to a pregnancy caused by a rape, we require that the law enforcement authorities be notified of the rape before the abortion, not at the time it occurred, and I think most Americans would want people to come forward and report rape.

It is a difficult situation, but we have commonsense exceptions, and this is a commonsense bill designed to change America in a commonsense way. It is a motion to proceed to put us in better standing as a nation in the world at large, I believe. It is also a motion to withdraw—withdraw from the club of seven nations that allows abortion on

demand at a time when doctors can save the baby's life, but to do so they have to provide anesthesia because that baby can feel so much pain.

Savannah Duke is a young lady in South Carolina. She is 17 years old. She goes to high school in Spartanburg, SC. She does all the things that a 17-year-old would do. She is an incredibly gifted young lady. At 20 weeks, it was discovered that she was missing a leg, and the doctors feared she would have severe birth defects. Her parents, Wendy and Scott, when deciding what to do, could see the baby move, and they decided not to opt for an abortion. She is in high school today.

There is Micah from Iowa, as you probably heard from Senator ERNST, who has been a stalwart on this issue. He was born at 20 weeks and is alive today to tell about it.

This is not about medical viability. *Roe v. Wade* says that there is a compelling State interest to protect the unborn at medical viability. I would argue that the difference between medical viability in 1973 and 2018 is enormous. What we are trying to do is provide a new theory to protect the unborn, and it goes something like this: Can a legislative body prohibit an abortion on demand at a time when science tells us that the baby feels excruciating pain, at a time when science tells us that parents should sing to their child, at a time when science tells us that a baby has well-connected tissues and can feel pain and, on occasion, can also survive? My answer is yes; it is OK for Congress and State legislators to pass laws saying that in the fifth month, we are going to disallow abortion on demand. There will be exceptions, but they will be rare. There are 10,000 cases every year that are protected by this law.

So what are we trying to do? We are trying to proceed forward to a better day in America. We are trying to get out of a club where there are only six other members. We are trying to reconcile the law with science.

To my friends on the other side who talk about science a lot, count me in. Science is very important. We should listen to our scientists. When it comes to climate change, I do. I am convinced that climate change is real.

You should listen to what doctors tell you about the unborn child in the fifth month. You should listen to what medical science is able to do to save the child's life. You should listen to the stories of people who actually make it at 20 weeks. You should understand that excruciating pain is felt by an unborn child in the fifth month, and America does not want to be in the club of seven countries that allow abortion on demand.

I don't know where the vote will turn out. It is probably going to be short of 60, but to those who believe in this issue, we will be back for another day. We are never going to give up until we get America in a better place. The better place, I think, would be having a

country that recognizes that, in the fifth month of pregnancy, the law will be there for the child, because science is on the child's side, and we will reconcile our laws to science.

We know what science says about a baby in the fifth month. We know what the law says: They can be aborted on demand. I think there is a disconnect, not only between science and law but between what is right and where we are today. I just don't see how this makes us a better nation, to continue this practice of allowing babies to be aborted on demand in the fifth month of pregnancy when we know they feel a lot of pain. I just don't see how that makes us a better nation. We will get there, Mr. President, with your help and the help of others.

A majority of the American people are on our side when they understand what we are trying to do. There are 20 States who have some version of this, and it is just a matter of time until most States will.

As to this debate, I don't think it is a waste of time. I want to do two things. I want to get out of the club of seven nations that allow abortion on demand of babies that feel excruciating pain when they are operated on to save their lives, and I can work on behalf of the Dreamers, too. I can do two things at once. I can talk about getting America in a better spot when it comes to babies during the fifth month of pregnancy and finding a better life for Dreamers. I think it is kind of odd that somehow you can't do one without the other.

I want all of these Dream Act kids—young adults now—to stay in the country they know. They have no other place to go. On average, they were brought here at the age of 6 and, if you told them to go home, it wouldn't be some foreign country. It would be the home they were raised in and the life they know. So it makes perfect sense to me that we should be trying to find a solution to secure our border and fix a broken immigration system and deal compassionately with millions of young people who, through no fault of their own, have no place else to go but America.

It also makes sense to me that we can talk about this issue at the same time and that we as a nation will rise to the occasion and withdraw from a club where there are only six other nations on the planet that allow a baby to be aborted in the fifth month of pregnancy at a time when that child can feel excruciating pain and young parents are encouraged to sing to the child. If science urges you to sing to the child, I want the law to stop an abortion unless there is a darn good reason. Our time will come, for the Dreamers as well as the baby. Our time will come.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on leader time.

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

NOMINATION OF DAVID STRAS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I know we have a vote coming up soon.

First, on the judge vote, today the Senate will vote on cloture on the nomination of David Stras for the Eighth Circuit in Minnesota. Senator Franken opposed this nomination and did not return his blue slip, but Senator GRASSLEY scheduled the confirmation hearing and a markup anyway. It is my understanding that the new Senator from Minnesota, Ms. SMITH, intends to vote against his nomination.

If Judge Stras is confirmed, it will mark the first time since 1982 that a circuit court nominee was confirmed without both home State Senators returning blue slips in support of a hearing. Democratic and Republican chairs have stuck to the blue slip rule, despite the tensions in this body. So this is a major step back—another way that the majority is slowly and inexorably gnawing away at the way this body works and making it more and more and more like the House of Representatives. It is not a legacy, if I were the leader or a Member of that party, that I would be proud of.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. President, tomorrow President Trump will address the Nation in his first State of the Union. We all look forward to hearing what the President has to say. One thing we can expect is for the President to link any good piece of economic news to the Republican tax bill, as the majority leader does most days and did again today. Of course, the reality of the Republican tax bill is much different than the image painted by the leader's cherry-picked examples.

One of the real impacts of the tax bill has been massive giveaways to wealthy investors and corporate executives. The very wealthiest and the most powerful got the overwhelming majority of the breaks. As for individuals, some got increases, some stayed the same, and some will get a little bit.

Companies have announced multibillion-dollar stock-buyback repurchasing programs, which benefit wealthy shareholders, not workers. According to Morgan Stanley, "83% of analysts indicated that companies would put gains from lower taxes to use for share buybacks, dividends, and mergers and acquisitions." So we will have less competition because this tax bill has given the big corporations money so they can buy other corporations and reduce competition.

Even though Republicans sold it as a job creator, there have been a slew of layoffs in this country just after the tax bill passed. Walmart, which made a big to-do of what it was doing for its workers, is shuttering 63 Sam's Club warehouses and laying off 1,000 workers at their headquarters. Macy's will cut 5,000 jobs. Carrier, a company the President promised to save, is still bleeding jobs. Kimberly-Clark will cut up to 5,500 jobs, and their chief financial officer said the savings from the Republican tax bill gave them the "flexibility"—his word—to make these reductions. So the tax bill is actually leading to a whole lot of layoffs. We don't hear that from President Trump or our Republican colleagues, but it is true.

Another one of the real impacts of the tax bill will be felt on tax day, when the Nation's highest income earners, the top 1 percent, will get an average tax cut of roughly \$50,000, while more than 9 million middle-class families will face a tax increase, according to the JCT and the Tax Policy Center.

It is true that bipartisan, deficit-neutral tax reform could have delivered more jobs and better pay for the middle class, but President Trump and congressional leaders opted for a partisan bill that rewarded their wealthy donors, big corporations, and the superrich, and it increased the deficit that our children and grandchildren will have to pay by \$1.5 trillion. I don't expect the President or the Republican leader to mention these facts. I certainly don't think the President will mention them in the State of the Union. But Democrats will highlight them in days to come.

ISSUES BEFORE THE SENATE

Now, Mr. President, when we passed the last extension of government funding, we gave ourselves a lengthy to-do list: Pass a budget, provide disaster aid, negotiate a healthcare package, and protect the Dreamers. We have been talking about these issues for months without resolution. Now is the time to start solving them. We have waited too long to fully fund our military. We have waited too long to dedicate more money to the opioid crisis, which is stealing 40,000 American lives a year. We have waited too long to improve veterans healthcare, which our veterans receive. Many are waiting in line still to get treatment. We waited too long to address failing pension plans, which are the safety net for so many teamsters, carpenters, miners, and people approaching retirement. We have waited too long to give the 800,000 Dreamers the peace of mind that they will not be deported by the only country they have known.

We need to address these issues soon—no more delay. We hope our moderate Senators will strive to find a narrow bill on DACA and border security that can actually pass. Expanding this beyond DACA and beyond border security, as the White House framework

tries to do, will only delay a solution to this time-sensitive problem.

Now, my guest at tomorrow's State of the Union will highlight the urgency of a few issues I have just mentioned. Her name is Stephanie Keegan. She is from Putnam County, NY. Her son Daniel, a veteran of the war in Afghanistan, died from an opioid overdose. At the time, Daniel was suffering from a severe case of PTSD. His nerves were shattered by war. He waited 16 months for treatment at the VA—16 months, after he served us so well. That is a shocking amount of time for a young man who bravely served his country to wait for his country to serve him. Daniel died 2 weeks before he was given his first appointment at the VA.

There are many things that can be done to change this situation, Mrs. Keegan told me. She is so right. We can provide better healthcare to our veterans. We can do more to fight the scourge of opioid addiction. We can fulfill the promise to hundreds of thousands of pensioners who need money. We can make sure Social Security works. We can make sure the kids waiting for college who have to pay for college can get there a little easier. So I hope Stephanie's presence at tomorrow's speech inspires an urgency to tackle these challenges.

FBI

Finally, Mr. President, I want to return to a topic I addressed at some length last Thursday—the ongoing scorched-earth campaign by the White House, rightwing media, and some Republicans in Congress to destroy the integrity of the FBI and the investigation into interference in the 2016 election. This ongoing scorched-earth campaign weakens law enforcement and weakens the FBI—one of our best agencies.

We recently learned that President Trump, at one point last summer, directed the firing of Special Counsel Mueller—what would have been a shocking and unambiguous obstruction of justice—only to be pulled back.

Today, we learned that the Deputy Director of the FBI, Andrew McCabe, will be stepping down immediately. He has been attacked by the White House relentlessly.

As soon as this evening, the House will vote to release the contents of a secret memo prepared by the Republican majority on the House Intelligence Committee that insinuates the FBI and Department of Justice's investigation into Russia's interference in our elections is politically biased.

According to the ranking member of that committee, Representative SCHIFF, this memo is full of innuendo and glaring omissions. It presents evidence without context and jumps to unfounded conclusions. We should call it what it truly is: a slanderous memo of GOP talking points.

This is not an erudite study. This is a bunch of talking points to discredit an agency that is doing a good job, that we all have supported and respected over the years.

If Republicans vote to release their memo of partisan talking points tonight, they should also vote to release the memo prepared by Ranking Member SCHIFF, and let everyone judge both on the merits. Let both memos go forward. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. It would be absolute hypocrisy for House Republicans to release their memo and not allow Representative SCHIFF to release his.

Everyone should keep in mind who is promoting this stuff. Who is promoting these rightwing talking points, defaming the FBI? None other than Russian-linked bots. They are using the hashtag “Release the Memo” 100 more times than any other hashtag by Kremlin-linked accounts. Putin and the Kremlin are trying at all times to undermine our democracy through the spread of false information.

What does it say about the Republican memo that the Kremlin is pushing it more than they are pushing anything else right now? At this point, every American should wonder whether the House Republicans are working harder for Putin or for the American people—at least those House Republicans who put together this memo.

This Republican talking points memo is part of a pattern of behavior from this White House and their Republican allies in Congress—not everyone, just some—and the hard-right media. They do not welcome the results of Special Counsel Mueller’s investigation, so they are trying to smear the investigation and the entire FBI before it concludes. We all know agents; we all know how hard they work and how decent they are.

The attacks on the credibility of the FBI are beyond the pale. They have fueled wild speculation and outright paranoia—talks of “coups” and “deep states” and “secret societies.” It brings shame on the folks propagating this nonsense, but more crucially, it diminishes our great country.

When prominent voices in one of our country’s two major political parties are outright attacking the FBI and the Department of Justice—the pillars of American law enforcement—they are playing right into Mr. Putin’s hands. They are unfairly and dishonestly clouding a crucial investigation into Russia’s interference in our elections—a matter of most serious concern for every American. It is abhorrent. It must stop.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2311, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Jerry Moran, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Tom Cotton, Joni Ernst, James M. Inhofe, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, James Lankford, Roy Blunt.

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 motion to proceed to S. 2311, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Flake	Perdue
Boozman	Gardner	Portman
Burr	Graham	Risch
Capito	Grassley	Roberts
Casey	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young

NAYS—46

Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Harris	Murray	
Hassan	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Baldwin	McCain	Nelson
---------	--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Tim Scott, Todd Young, Richard C. Shelby, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, Jerry Moran, David Perdue, Tom Cotton, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune.

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 David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 26 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Gardner	Murkowski
Blunt	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Perdue
Burr	Hatch	Portman
Capito	Heitkamp	Risch
Cassidy	Heller	Roberts
Cochran	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott
Cotton	Jones	Shelby
Crapo	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Klobuchar	Thune
Daines	Lankford	Tillis
Donnelly	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	Manchin	Warner
Ernst	McCaskill	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	Young

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hassan	Schatz
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	

NOT VOTING—2

McCain	Nelson
--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION BILL

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the United States is just one of seven countries in the entire world that currently allow elective abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, and we are not in good company on that list. Of the other six countries that allow elective abortions at that very late stage of the child's development, half of those countries have authoritarian governments—communist governments with horrible records when it comes to human rights.

Yes, our abortion laws are as extreme and inhumane as the abortion laws in Vietnam, China, and North Korea. It pains me—and it should pain all Americans—that the United States lags so very far behind the rest of the world in protecting the unborn, protecting human beings, simply because they have yet to take their first breath.

Twenty weeks is the fifth month of pregnancy. Think about what that means. At that stage, the unborn child is about 10 inches long from head to toe. He or she is roughly the size of a banana. A baby at this stage sleeps and wakes in the womb. She sucks her thumb, makes faces, and, in some cases, might even see light filtering in through the womb.

By 20 weeks, if not before, science suggests that the baby can also feel pain. Each year in this country, more than 10,000 abortions occur after this point in the baby's development. Today, we have a chance to stop this grave injustice.

Moments ago, this body voted on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, a bill that would prohibit abortions after the 20th week of pregnancy. This is a commonsense restriction that is supported by a majority of Americans. More than 6 in 10 Americans support a ban on abortion after 20 weeks, according to a Marist poll conducted earlier this month. Not only that, but a majority of Democrats—56 percent—said they would support an abortion ban at 20 weeks. Yes, this bill does, in fact, have widespread support, and it would bring America back into the mainstream of nations.

More importantly, this bill is just. It is humane. It is the right thing to do. It is the natural outcome of any question asked with a degree of moral probity: Is this right?

The reason we signed up for this job is to fight for what is right. And it is wrong—self-evidently wrong—that our country allows 5-month-old unborn babies to be killed. We, in this body, have

a moral duty to protect those vulnerable human beings, but I have no illusions that this will be easy.

We have to overcome the misinformation of the abortion industry. This is a powerful special interest group that wants to keep abortion legal right up to the moment of birth. The abortion industry is attacking this bill by denying that there is any evidence that unborn babies can feel pain at 20 weeks. The linchpin of its argument is a 2005 study that claimed unborn babies could not feel pain until the 30th week of pregnancy. What the abortion industry never mentions, of course, is that this study was written by individuals with significant and, I would add, undisclosed ties to the abortion industry itself.

As reported by the Philadelphia Inquirer, the study's lead author, who was not a doctor but a medical student, previously worked for NARAL. Another of the study's authors actually performed abortions as the medical director of an abortion clinic.

How convenient that the abortion industry's denial of fetal pain rests on a study by its own employees. If I recall, the tobacco industry tried something similar when they denied that cigarettes cause cancer. As always, the antidote to misinformation is more information, and the antidote to bad science is good science.

I have three studies that address the topic of fetal pain specifically. They were all published after the abortion industry's favorite study—the one they prefer to acknowledge to the exclusion of all others. Unlike that study—the one they prefer to the exclusion of all others—none of these studies are compromised by a conflict of interest.

This one is by the International Association for the Study of Pain. It concludes: "The available scientific evidence makes it possible, even probable, that fetal pain perception occurs well before late gestation." The study pinpoints fetal pain to the "second trimester" of pregnancy, "well before the third trimester."

Here is another study by the American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists. It concludes that "the basis for pain perception appear[s] at about 20 to 22 weeks from conception."

Finally, here is a 2012 study published in the Journal of Maternal-Fetal and Neonatal Medicine. This paper states that there is evidence that unborn children can feel pain beginning at 20 weeks. The authors note that at this stage, unborn children have pain receptors in their skin, recoil in response to sharp objects like needles, and release stress hormones when they are harmed.

They conclude: "We should suppose that the fetus can feel pain. . . . When the development of the fetus is equal to that of a premature baby."

I could go on, but I think that is enough for now. The takeaway is this. The science at a minimum suggests that unborn children can feel pain

around 20 weeks. It can feel the abortionists' instruments as they do their grisly work.

These children feel until they cannot. That possibility alone—the mere possibility—should be chilling to us, and that possibility alone should have us rushing to ban abortion at 20 weeks. I implore my colleagues who didn't vote for this to reconsider and, the next time they have an opportunity to support it, to vote yes on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

A vote for this bill is a vote to protect some of the most vulnerable members of the human family. And yes, we are talking about members of the human family. The life form we are talking about is not a puppy; it is not some other form of animal. This is a human being we are talking about. This is something that instinctively calls out for us. We think about the needs of the most vulnerable among us, and we should be eager to protect them.

Together, we can move our country's laws away from those of North Korea and China and toward our most fundamental belief that all human beings are created equal and that they have an unalienable right to life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose dangerous legislation that would endanger the health of women by limiting their constitutional right to access a safe and legal abortion. We must recognize the capacity of every woman in our Nation to make her own healthcare decisions, control her own destiny, and ensure that all women have the full independence to do so.

Unfortunately, throughout the last year, the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress have repeatedly tried to roll back access to care and undermine the health of women. We have seen bill after bill targeting women's healthcare by restricting access to abortion, increasing the costs of maternity care, and allowing insurers to treat giving birth as a preexisting condition.

The Trump administration issued interim final rules, allowing employers to deny women access to the birth control coverage they need. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have confirmed Trump administration officials and judges to the bench who are vehemently opposed to a woman's right to make her own reproductive health decisions. Republicans have been relentless in their attempts to defund Planned Parenthood, which is an essential source of care for women in New Hampshire and provides key services like birth control and cancer screenings.

Here we are, once again, with Republican leadership bringing a bill to the floor that attempts to marginalize women and take away their rights to make their own decisions. This bill

would ban abortions after 20 weeks—an extremely rare procedure that is often the result of complex and difficult medical circumstances. The bill lacks adequate exceptions for survivors of rape or incest, and it gets in the way of a woman and the judgment of her doctor, threatening to jail physicians for providing patients the care they need.

In fact, a group of medical and public health organizations have written to Congress, saying: This bill places healthcare providers in an untenable situation. When they are facing a complex, urgent medical situation they must think about an unjust law instead of about how to protect the health and safety of their patients.

This bill is a direct challenge to the precedent set in *Roe v. Wade*. We are at a moment in our country when women are speaking out and fighting for basic dignity and respect at home, in the workplace, and in their daily lives. They also deserve that respect with regard to the most deeply personal health decisions they can make.

Passing this legislation would send a message to women across the country that politicians in Washington do not believe that women have the capacity to make their own healthcare decisions—as if women don't understand or are unable to grapple with the physical, emotional, economic, and spiritual issues that are involved in deciding when or if to have a family or how to handle critical health challenges.

Rather than marginalizing women, we should be doing everything we can to include them in the bipartisan work we need to do on priorities to move our Nation forward. Divisive and partisan bills like this one undermine women and undermine our strength as a country. I was proud to join many of my colleagues in voting against this bill, and I am glad that it has failed in the Senate today.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

TRIBUTE TO MARY KAY THATCHER

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I want to take a moment this evening to congratulate one of the most effective advocates for American agriculture in our Nation's Capital.

We are often helped by those who have lots of knowledge. In the coming days, Mary Kay Thatcher will be retiring from the American Farm Bureau, where she is widely recognized as one of the most knowledgeable experts on farm policy, conservation, crop insurance, ag data, and so many other issues that affect farmers and ranchers and rural America. Mary Kay represents the best of Washington, DC. She is smart, passionate, and authentic. Again, we often need help from those who have expertise to help us make the right decisions, and she is absolutely one of those people.

A great thing about Mary Kay Thatcher is that she hasn't forgotten her rural roots. It is evidenced by her

clear convictions and steadfast support for American farmers and ranchers. Too many people come to the beltway and they forget why they are here—but not Mary Kay. Throughout her career of more than 30 years, she has never lost sight of what ought to be the mission of each of ours—to use our positions, our talents, and our abilities to help others. For Mary Kay Thatcher, her career has been all about helping America's farmers and ranchers, standing up for the food and fiber producers of our Nation. Let me tell you that she is one of the best at it.

Not only is Mary Kay one of the most articulate ag lobbyists I know, she is one of the most articulate people I know. Her ability to break down an issue and make it understandable for everyone—for Senators and our staffs, including those who don't have ag backgrounds—makes her one of the most effective advocates for agriculture. There are fewer and fewer people in the U.S. Senate and Congress who understand agriculture or who come from farming backgrounds, and that ability to connect with them is so important.

I have always appreciated the advice and counsel that Mary Kay has provided me when working on the farm bill or other pieces of ag legislation. I have also always noticed and appreciated how much time she has spent in educating staff, including those in my office. I believe a big part of Mary Kay's legacy will be the generations of young people who will be better prepared to continue the fight for American agriculture because Mary Kay has taken the time and made the effort to mentor and to teach them.

Her passion for agriculture comes naturally. She grew up on an Iowa farm and continues to own and manage that farm today, and that helps guide her work here in the Nation's Capital. She has worked at the American Farm Bureau for over 30 years, but in ag circles, it is not necessarily the number of years that people talk about but the number of farm bills. They refer to how many farm bills a person has survived. By my count, Mary Kay has been part of writing at least seven farm bills in addition to many other key pieces of ag legislation.

I know I am adding my voice to lots of others who will talk about how great of a person she is and what an advocate she is, but I do want to add my accolades because they are so well-deserved.

I thank Mary Kay Thatcher for all of her work on behalf of American agriculture, including the Kansas Farm Bureau and its members, and on behalf of all of agriculture in our State. Her efforts have benefited Kansas and improved our country. She will be missed at the American Farm Bureau, but I know she will find other ways to advocate for agriculture. I hope that for many years to come, we will remain friends and work together on behalf of American farmers and ranchers.

Congratulations and best wishes. Thank you—said with great respect and with gratitude.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION BILL

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, there are a lot of important things the Senate is taking up right now. Obviously, there is the issue of immigration, the budget, and disaster relief. There are a lot of pertinent issues that need to be resolved. One of those things that was in the middle of the conversation came up today. It is part of a conversation that, quite frankly, doesn't come up often in this body, but this seemed like a reasonable piece to be able to come up. It came up to the Senate to open debate on it, and it failed to get the 60 votes to support the beginning of what should be an easy conversation on a hard issue—this issue about children and life.

In 1973, when *Roe v. Wade* passed, the Supreme Court at that time determined that for children that were viable—and that is the definition they left out there—there is a governmental interest in being able to engage with those children. Well, viability in 1973 was very different than what it is now, decades later. In 1973 viable was a much older child. Now that we know a lot more, a lot more children survive. Children who are born at 22 weeks of gestation have between a 50-percent to 60-percent chance of survival now. That was not true in 1973.

The rest of the world has caught up with this technology, and their governments have acknowledged of this issue that a child who has 10 fingers and 10 toes and a beating heart—they suck their thumb in the womb, they yawn, they stretch, they move—is a child.

I understand there is wide argument about a child that is at 8 weeks of gestation, whom I believe is a child, but others look at it and say: It doesn't look like a child yet. But a child at 20, 22, 24 weeks of gestation even looks like a child when you look at the child in the ultrasound. It is hard to disagree, especially when children are born at that age prematurely and they survive, and many of us know kids that were born at 22 weeks. The bill that came up today on the Senate floor, which had bipartisan support and had a majority of support but not 60 Senators' support to be able to discuss this, was a very simple, straightforward bill. It asked just one question: Will we as Americans continue to allow elective abortions when the child is viable?

The Supreme Court said in 1973 that the government has a right to be able to step in and protect a viable child. There is no question that they are at that age of viability. There is no question, at that age of 20 weeks, that science shows us they experience pain in the womb, and that if surgery happens for a child in utero like that, that child is actually given anesthetic to be

able to calm their pain during that surgery because they have a developed nervous system and because they have a beating heart. This body refused to even take up the issue and debate it.

There is no question that I am very passionate about the issue of life and about children, and that we should as a culture protect children. But this one confuses me—for this body, more than any other issue. There are only seven nations in the world that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks. There are only four nations in the world that allow elective abortions after 24 weeks. We are in that elite club. We are in the elite club with three other nations that allow elective abortions that late—Vietnam, North Korea, and China—the worst human rights violators in the world. There sits the United States in that very elite club.

Why are we there? Because we can't even discuss the possibility that a child is a child, and anyone who has ever seen an ultrasound at 24 weeks cannot deny that is a child, and if that child was delivered prematurely, they would survive and grow and develop into a person. The only difference between that child at 20 weeks and an adult now is time.

This issue will continue to come up, and it should because we as a culture should promote a culture of life and of honoring people—people at their most vulnerable moment. There is no more vulnerable a moment than that for that child. We have to get out of this club of elective abortions and the only group that allows it—North Korea, China, and Vietnam. When will we wake up to the fact that the entire rest of the world—all of Europe, all of Africa, all of Central America, all of South America, every one of those countries—sees that plain? A child is a child, and we need to be able to guard its life.

So I am sad that today in a bipartisan vote with more than 50 votes to be able to get into it and pass it, we didn't have enough people even to want to discuss it and to be able to bring up the bill. We will bring it up again for the sake of those children and their futures. We will bring it up again, and we will keep bringing up the facts of the argument, not the emotion but the facts of the argument, and we will win people over.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 497.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gregory E. Maggs, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United

States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces for the term of fifteen years to expire on the date prescribed by law.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Maggs nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO EARL SMITH

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the legacy and heroic service of Mr. Earl Smith. An Alabama native and unsung American hero, Smith's willingness to put himself in harm's way saved an untold number of lives.

More than 50 years ago, as a young officer in the U.S. Air Force, Smith was the on-call explosive ordnance disposal, EOD, technician at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base in Goldsboro, NC. Nothing out of the ordinary had occurred throughout his shift on the evening of January 23, 1961, when the 24-year-old Smith received an alarming phone call. He was informed that two Mark 39 hydrogen bombs had broken loose from a B-52 bomber and landed in a field just outside of Goldsboro. He was told the general location of the bombs, but other details were unknown.

Upon arriving to the crash site, Smith and other EOD technicians found that one bomb had crashed at such a speed that it was buried underground, but the other was visible and appeared to be intact. Although the protocol was to alert the Atomic Energy Commission before inspecting the bomb, Smith's instinct was to act quickly. Dr. Ralph Lapp, a physicist involved in developing America's first nuclear bombs as part of the Manhattan Project, stated in his review of the Goldsboro incident that "one simple, dynamo-technology low voltage switch

stood between the United States and a major catastrophe."

Smith graduated from the U.S. Navy's EOD school just 9 months prior to the incident. However, his training, combined with his immense bravery, allowed him and other EOD technicians to successfully disarm the bomb over several days of harrowing work. Experts estimate that, if detonated, the bombs were powerful enough to destroy everything within an 8.5 mile radius. When asked in a recent interview why the bomb did not go off, Smith replied, "the Lord Jesus Christ only knows."

Such incidents prove that the security we enjoy every day as Americans is because of courageous individuals like Earl Smith. Smith's willingness to risk his life, along with his ability to maintain the secrecy of this formerly classified event for half a century, serve as distinct and sobering reminders that there are American men and women serving tirelessly throughout the world to maintain the way of life we hold dear.

It is my honor to offer my sincere appreciation and gratitude to Earl Smith and the countless others like him who diligently, and often thanklessly, work to provide safety and security to all Americans. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will join me in thanking them for their selfless service to this Nation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO PATTI MEALS

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Patti Meals on her retirement from CARE Chest of Sierra Nevada. For 26 years, Patti made an indelible impact on the people of northern Nevada as executive director of CARE Chest.

From serving 334 Nevadans in 1990, when the CARE Chest first opened, to more than 13,000 in 2017, Ms. Meals has helped provide over 139,000 services and distribute 220,000 pieces of medical equipment and supplies in her career.

With Ms. Meals' dedication and passion, CARE Chest of Sierra Nevada has made great strides in improving the health and well-being of countless northern Nevadans by providing free medical resources to those in need.

The group's programs are tailored to aid and support the area's underserved populations and include connecting local families to medical equipment, prescription assistance, diabetic supplies, medical nutrition, home and vehicle modifications, and wellness education.

As a result of Ms. Meals' work, CARE Chest today owns its 5,000-square-foot facility in Reno and is considered a cornerstone of the northern Nevada community. The nonprofit has helped thousands of vulnerable Nevadans in their path to recovery. It is worth noting that, in 2010, during Ms. Meals' tenure, CARE Chest of Sierra Nevada was

named Human Services Network's Agency of the Year.

Ms. Meals is also a founding member of Alliance for Nevada Nonprofits, ANN, a group that aims to be a leader and voice for Nevada's nonprofit sector; and the resource for sustainability, advocacy, and professionalism. Since 2009, Ms. Meals has held a board position and currently serves as the board treasurer. She is also an active and long-term member of the Sparks Rotary and has collaborated with countless community organizations over the years.

As Nevada's senior Senator, I want to thank Ms. Meals for her tireless efforts during the last quarter of a century. I offer her the very best during her retirement and my well wishes for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

REMEMBERING GEORGE TWIGG III

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to pay tribute to George Twigg III, a long-time Granite Stater and former New Hampshire State representative, who passed away last month at the age of 85. Though he was raised in Massachusetts and retired to Maine, George was in many ways a quintessential Granite Stater, with a big personality, a great sense of humor, and a lifetime passion for politics and public engagement.

After graduating from Boston University, he served 2 years in the U.S. Navy and later worked as a marketing representative for General Electric and other Fortune 500 companies. In 1968, he left his corporate career behind and moved to Gilmanton, NH, where he became a proud jack-of-many-trades, working in real estate sales, auctioneering, and appraising. George also worked as a justice of the peace, officiating at hundreds of weddings. He once married the same couple twice, though he felt obliged to warn them that, if they divorced again and later decided to marry for a third time, they would have to find someone else to officiate at the wedding.

Throughout his adult life, George was active in politics and public service and gave generously of his time as a volunteer in many different capacities. A lifelong Republican, he shared many Granite Staters' fiscal conservatism and distaste for taxes. Indeed, in one campaign for election to the New Hampshire House of Representatives, he crisscrossed his district in a snowplow painted with the message "No Tax Snow Jobs." While always true to his conservative convictions, George was a practitioner of the New Hampshire way in politics, always ready to reach across the aisle in order to advance the best interests of our State. In 1974, then-Governor Meldrim Thomson asked him to chair New Hampshire's eminent domain commission. He went on to serve 21 years on the board of tax and land appeals.

George was a man of exceptional generosity. In 2014, he sold more than 85

acres of scenic land in Gilmanton at a price below fair-market value on the condition that it be preserved as open space for future generations to enjoy. He was equally generous in giving his time and talents to a wide range of volunteer activities. For decades, he refereed high school and college basketball games. He served on numerous town and county committees and volunteered his considerable skills as an auctioneer for countless charity auctions, including fundraisers for New Hampshire's public television station.

The Granite State, and the Gilmanton community in particular, are grateful for his many gifts and acts of selfless service. Family and friends hope to gather for a memorial service later this year. I will be with them in spirit as they celebrate the life of this good and generous man.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803 (a)), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional Award Board: Mr. HUDSON of North Carolina; And, in addition: Mr. Steve Hart of Washington, DC, Ms. Kimberly Norman of Dallas, Texas, Mr. Michael Pitts, Jr., of Kenosha, Wisconsin, Mr. Marc Baer of Savage, Minnesota, and Mr. Jason Van Pelt, of Washington, DC.

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 Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 2349. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to establish an interagency working group to study Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence and to make recommendations on the harmonization of such efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 2350. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a forest incentives program to keep forests intact and sequester carbon on private forest land of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2351. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that an individual may remain eligible to participate in the teacher loan forgiveness program under title IV of such Act if the individual's period of consecutive years of employment as a full-time teacher is interrupted because the individual is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is relocated during the school year pursuant to military orders for a permanent change of duty station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 2352. A bill to cap the emissions of greenhouse gases through a requirement to purchase carbon permits, to distribute the proceeds of such purchases to eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2353. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to report on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 384. A resolution congratulating the Republic of Korea for hosting the 2018 Winter Olympic Games and supporting the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 385. A resolution supporting the observation of "National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month" during the period beginning on January 1, 2018, and ending on February 1, 2018, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 243

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 243, a bill to provide for a permanent extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in

recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 337

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 337, a bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an energy equivalent of a gallon of diesel in the case of liquefied natural gas for purposes of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund financing rate.

S. 818

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 818, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with disabilities to save additional amounts in their ABLE accounts above the current annual maximum contribution if they work and earn income.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 836, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes.

S. 1344

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1344, a bill to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 with public and private resources, to enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, and for other purposes.

S. 1453

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1453, a bill to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to designate certain substance use disorder treatment facilities as eligible for National Health Service Corps service.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1678

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 1678, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to improve access to grants and loans for evidence-based substance use disorder treatment services in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 2219

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2219, a bill to reduce the number of preventable deaths and injuries caused by underride crashes, to improve motor carrier and passenger motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes.

S. 2341

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2341, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 361

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 361, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Government shall, both unilaterally and alongside the international community, consider all options for exerting maximum pressure on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), in order to denuclearize the DPRK, protect the lives of United States citizens and allies, and prevent further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

S. RES. 368

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 368, a resolution supporting the right of all Iranian citizens to have their voices heard.

S. RES. 376

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 376, a resolution urging the Governments of Burma and Bangladesh to ensure the safe, dignified, voluntary, and sustainable return of the Rohingya refugees who have been displaced by the campaign of ethnic cleansing conducted by the Burmese military.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 377, a resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have

faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2018, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2351. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that an individual may remain eligible to participate in the teacher loan forgiveness program under title IV of such Act if the individual's period of consecutive years of employment as a full-time teacher is interrupted because the individual is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is relocated during the school year pursuant to military orders for a permanent change of duty station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would like to bring the Senate's attention to the bipartisan Preserving Teacher Loan Forgiveness for Military Spouses Act of 2018, which I am introducing with the Senior Senator from Texas today. This legislation eliminates a barrier for teachers in military families to earn Federal student loan forgiveness for their years of public service.

The Department of Education's Teacher Loan Forgiveness program incentivizes teachers to commit to students in our lowest income school districts in exchange for up to \$17,500 in Federal Student loan forgiveness. Teachers qualify for the program once they have taught full-time for at least 5 consecutive years at a low income school or educational service agency. Teachers who are forced to move in the middle of the school year to follow their spouse lose eligibility for the program and must restart their 5 years of service under current law.

Last summer, a Maryland constituent brought to my attention the barriers her daughter faced when seeking Federal student loan forgiveness despite her commitment to public service. Her daughter, a teacher married to a member of the military, was in the middle of her fifth consecutive year teaching at one of Maryland's lower income schools. As any military spouse knows, relocation or reassignment orders can come at any time, upending the lives of the service member and their family. Rather than being able to complete a 5th year of teaching in a Maryland school, this family had to relocate with 3 months left in the school year. Despite this family's double commitment to service for our military and our schoolchildren, this military spouse missed the opportunity to have a portion of her Federal student loans

forgiven. No military spouse should be punished for following his or her spouse's relocation or reassignment.

The legislation that the Senior Senator from Texas and I have introduced is a common sense proposal to allow military spouses to earn the benefits that they have dutifully worked towards and continue to incentivize individuals to teach our hardest to educate children. Our legislation provides a waiver from the Department of Education's Teacher Loan Forgiveness program's 5 consecutive years of service requirement for qualified military spouses if their spouse is relocated during the school year pursuant to military orders from the Armed Forces. This waiver will allow individuals to remain eligible for the Teacher Loan Forgiveness program should they resume teaching full-time at a qualifying low-income school district within one year of their relocation. In addition, this legislation requires the Department of Education to provide a report to Congress every two years on the number of military spouses who remained eligible for Teacher Loan Forgiveness due to this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join in this effort to help families who are wholly committed to public service by supporting the Preserving Teacher Loan Forgiveness for Military Spouses Act. No family in service of our Nation should lose out on earned benefits due to a technicality.

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

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

S. 2351

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 "Preserving Teacher Loan Forgiveness for Military Spouses Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDENT LOAN FORGIVENESS OR LOAN CANCELLATION PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS WHOSE PERIOD OF CONSECUTIVE EMPLOYMENT IS INTERRUPTED BECAUSE OF MILITARY ORDERS REQUIRING SPOUSE TO RELOCATE TO NEW RESIDENCE.

(a) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) PART B LOANS.—Section 428J(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078–10(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN MILITARY SPOUSES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of subsection (b), an individual who is employed in a full-time teaching position that meets the requirements of this section for a period that includes 5 complete but nonconsecutive years may be eligible for loan forgiveness pursuant to such subsection, if the individual was a qualified military spouse with respect to any year during such period for which the individual was not employed as a full-time teacher in a school or location meeting the requirements of this section.

"(B) QUALIFIED MILITARY SPOUSE DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'quali-

fied military spouse' means, with respect to a year, an individual who—

"(i) during the previous year, served as a teacher in a school or location meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) of subsection (b)(1) and met the requirements of subparagraph (B) of subsection (b)(1);

"(ii) is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is relocated during the year pursuant to military orders for a permanent change of duty station;

"(iii) did not serve as a teacher in a school or location meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) of subsection (b)(1) during the year or any portion of the year because the individual accompanied the spouse to a new residence as a result of such military orders; and

"(iv) during the following year, resumed service as a teacher in a school or location meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) of subsection (b)(1) and met the requirements of subparagraph (B) of subsection (b)(1).

"(C) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the end of the second academic year during which this paragraph is in effect, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the number of individuals who, as a result of this paragraph, remained eligible for loan forgiveness pursuant to subsection (b) during the 2 most recent academic years."

(2) PART D LOANS.—Section 460(g) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087j(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN MILITARY SPOUSES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of subsection (b), an individual who is employed in a full-time teaching position that meets the requirements of this section for a period that includes 5 complete but nonconsecutive years may be eligible for loan cancellation pursuant to such subsection, if the individual was a qualified military spouse with respect to any year during such period for which the individual was not employed as a full-time teacher in a school or location meeting the requirements of this section.

"(B) QUALIFIED MILITARY SPOUSE DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'qualified military spouse' means, with respect to a year, an individual who—

"(i) during the previous year, served as a teacher in a school or location meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) of subsection (b)(1) and met the requirements of subparagraph (B) of subsection (b)(1);

"(ii) is the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is relocated during the year pursuant to military orders for a permanent change of duty station;

"(iii) did not serve as a teacher in a school or location meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) of subsection (b)(1) during the year or any portion of the year because the individual accompanied the spouse to a new residence as a result of such military orders; and

"(iv) during the following year, resumed service as a teacher in a school or location meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A) of subsection (b)(1) and met the requirements of subparagraph (B) of subsection (b)(1).

"(C) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the end of the second academic year during which this paragraph is in effect, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the number of individuals who, as a result of this paragraph, remained eligible for loan cancellation pursuant to subsection

(b) during the 2 most recent academic years."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to individuals who first become employed as full-time teachers on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 2352. A bill to cap the emissions of greenhouse gases through a requirement to purchase carbon permits, to distribute the proceeds of such purchases to eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, climate change is a clear and present danger, but we can confront that danger in a way that presents new economic opportunities. While the Trump Administration has abdicated American leadership on this critical issue, Congress must fight back, which is why today I am introducing the Healthy Climate and Family Security Act for the first time in the U.S. Senate.

Two of the most pressing challenges we face as a Nation are the need to address the economic costs and public health risks associated with climate change, and to strengthen the middle class. We do both in this bill. By capping carbon emissions, selling permits, and returning 100 percent of the revenue to everyone equally, this 'Cap and Dividend' approach achieves necessary greenhouse gas reductions while boosting the purchasing power of families across the country.

Mr. President, the Healthy Climate and Family Security Act is a simple, effective, and transparent way to combat climate change while supporting economic growth and a thriving middle class. The solution is market based, pro-growth, and is built to last.

The bill achieves reductions in greenhouse gas emissions while increasing incomes for Americans. It places a declining cap on carbon pollution each year to reach 80 percent below 2005 levels by 2050. A polluter pays principle is then applied by requiring the first sellers of carbon to buy permits for emissions within those caps. Finally, 100 percent of the revenue raised from the sale of those permits is returned straight to the American people through a Healthy Climate Dividend. On an economy-wide level, the price signal placed on carbon pollution will accelerate innovation and incentivize both greater energy efficiency as well as greater use of lower-carbon energy alternatives. And the bill's robust border adjustment protections ensure that U.S. companies are not disadvantaged against foreign competitors at home or abroad.

In sum, this legislation puts a price on carbon pollution and returns the proceeds directly to the American people at the same time it accelerates the growth of good paying jobs in clean technologies. It is a win-win-win, boosting middle class pocketbooks, growing good paying jobs, and reducing our carbon footprint.

Mr. President, I am pleased that Representative DON BEYER of Virginia, a strong advocate for the environment, is introducing a companion measure in the House. I want to thank Mike Tidwell of the Chesapeake Climate Action Network, who has been helpful in developing this legislation. Other organizations such as the League of Conservation Voters and the Sierra Club are supportive of this approach. I look forward to working together to address the most pressing environmental problem of our time: climate change.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 2018

S. RES. 383

Whereas women constitute 50.4 percent of people in the United States;

Whereas women of different race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and age experience many diseases and disorders differently than men experience diseases and disorders;

Whereas those different experiences are reflected in the incidence, prevalence, symptomatology, and severity of the disease or disorder;

Whereas the risks and benefits of medical therapies vary based on the race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and age of a woman;

Whereas women and men have fundamental biological differences;

Whereas, for many years, women of different race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and age were underrepresented in biomedical and clinical research;

Whereas the improvement of the health of women relies on sex- and gender-based biomedical and clinical research;

Whereas the promise of individualized medicine cannot be realized without sex- and gender-based parity in research;

Whereas on January 25, 2016, the National Institutes of Health implemented a policy requiring federally funded investigators to consider sex as a biological variable in pre-clinical research; and

Whereas that policy ushered in a new era of inclusivity and parity in research relating to the health of women: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Senate—

(1) expresses support for the designation of a “Women’s Health Research Day”; and

(2) supports efforts to—

(A) recognize the importance of biomedical and clinical research to the health and well-being of women;

(B) increase awareness of the value of sex- and gender-based biomedical research; and

(C) encourage individuals, including researchers and patients, to advocate on behalf of sex- and gender-inclusive research for women of different race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and age.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 384—CONGRATULATING THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA FOR HOSTING THE 2018 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES AND SUPPORTING THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HOEVEN,

Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 384

Whereas the 23rd Olympic Winter Games (referred to in this preamble as “Olympic Winter Games PyeongChang 2018”) will be held from February 9 to February 25, 2018, in PyeongChang, Gangwon Province in the Republic of Korea;

Whereas the Olympic Winter Games PyeongChang 2018 represents the second Olympic Games hosted by the Republic of Korea;

Whereas the Republic of Korea hosted the Olympic Games for the first time in Seoul in the summer of 1988;

Whereas the Olympic Winter Games PyeongChang 2018 will feature—

(1) 102 events across 15 disciplines; and

(2) the participation of 93 National Olympic Committee teams;

Whereas the United States Olympic Team is expected to comprise approximately 240 athletes competing across all 15 disciplines;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee is headquartered in Colorado Springs, Colorado;

Whereas the Republic of Korea will also host in PyeongChang the 12th Paralympic Games from March 9 to March 18, 2018 that will feature—

(1) 80 events across 6 disciplines; and

(2) the participation of approximately 42 National Olympic Committee teams;

Whereas the theme of the Olympic Winter Games PyeongChang 2018 is “Passion. Connected.” and refers to the vision of the Republic of Korea of a world in which everyone is connected through a shared passion for winter sports;

Whereas on November 13, 2017, the United Nations General Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution entitled “Building a peaceful and better world through sport and the Olympic ideal”;

Whereas that resolution expresses the expectation of the United Nations General Assembly that “PyeongChang 2018 will be a meaningful opportunity to foster an atmosphere of peace, development, tolerance, and understanding on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia”;

Whereas on January 4, 2018, President Donald J. Trump and President Moon Jae-In of the Republic of Korea discussed recent developments on the Korean Peninsula and agreed that “the United States and the Republic of Korea are committed to a safe and successful 2018 Winter Olympic Games in PyeongChang”;

Whereas President Trump conveyed to President Moon that “the United States will send a high-level delegation to the Olympics,” which will be led by Vice President Michael R. Pence and Second Lady Karen Pence;

Whereas President Trump and President Moon further agreed to “de-conflict the Olympics and our military exercises so that United States and Republic of Korea forces can focus on ensuring the security of the Games”;

Whereas the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (referred to in this preamble as “DPRK”) recently reopened a telephone hotline “to normalize the Panmunjom communications channel” at the Joint Security Area located in the Demilitarized Zone;

Whereas on January 9, 2018, representatives of the Republic of Korea and the DPRK

held the first official talks in more than 2 years with the aim of discussing cooperation during the Olympic Winter Games PyeongChang 2018;

Whereas the DPRK has indicated that it plans to participate in the Olympic Winter Games PyeongChang 2018;

Whereas the DPRK is currently in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), 2094 (2013), 2270 (2016), 2321 (2016), 2371 (2017), 2375 (2017), and 2397 (2017) that—

(1) condemn the illicit nuclear and ballistic missile programs of the DPRK; and

(2) impose economic sanctions against the DPRK and entities that enable the DPRK; and

Whereas the DPRK engages in gross human rights abuses against the citizens of the DPRK and the citizens of other countries, including the United States and the Republic of Korea: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the strong and unwavering commitment of the United States to an ally, the Republic of Korea, to support, participate in, and help ensure the safety and security of the 23rd Olympic Winter Games (referred to in this resolving clause as “Olympic Winter Games PyeongChang 2018”);

(2) recognizes the importance of the Olympic Winter Games PyeongChang 2018 as a leading international sporting event of genuine sportsmanship and fair play that can contribute to peace and prosperity on the Korean Peninsula, in Northeast Asia, and around the world;

(3) reaffirms that the United States, the Republic of Korea, and other partners remain committed to pursuing the policy of “maximum pressure and engagement” toward the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (referred to in this resolving clause as “DPRK”), including by fully abiding by the letter and spirit of the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council;

(4) expresses hope that the Olympic Winter Games PyeongChang 2018 will contribute to the decision by the DPRK to engage in negotiations that will result in complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula; and

(5) wishes every success in preparing and hosting the Olympic Winter Games PyeongChang 2018 to the government and people of the Republic of Korea and the PyeongChang Organizing Committee for the 2018 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.

SENATE RESOLUTION 385—SUPPORTING THE OBSERVATION OF “NATIONAL TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY PREVENTION MONTH” DURING THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON JANUARY 1, 2018, AND ENDING ON FEBRUARY 1, 2018, TO RAISE AWARENESS OF, AND OPPOSITION TO, HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 385

Whereas the United States abolished the transatlantic slave trade in 1808 and abolished chattel slavery and prohibited involuntary servitude in 1865;

Whereas, because the people of the United States remain committed to protecting individual freedom, there is a national imperative to eliminate human trafficking and modern slavery, which is commonly considered to mean—

(1) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of an individual through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjecting that individual to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery; or

(2) the inducement of a commercial sex act by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the individual induced to perform that act is younger than 18 years of age;

Whereas the Department of Justice has reported that human trafficking and modern slavery has been reported and investigated in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas, to help businesses in the United States combat child labor and forced labor in global supply chains, the Department of Labor has identified 139 goods from 75 countries that are made by child labor and forced labor;

Whereas the Department of State has reported that the top 3 countries of origin of Federally identified trafficking victims in 2016 were the United States, Mexico, and the Philippines;

Whereas, to combat human trafficking and modern slavery in the United States and globally, the people of the United States, the Federal Government, and State and local governments must be—

(1) aware of the realities of human trafficking and modern slavery; and

(2) dedicated to stopping the horrific enterprise of human trafficking and modern slavery;

Whereas the United States should hold accountable all individuals, groups, organizations, and countries that support, advance, or commit acts of human trafficking and modern slavery;

Whereas, through education, the United States must also work to end human trafficking and modern slavery in all forms in the United States and around the world;

Whereas victims of human trafficking and modern slavery should receive the necessary resources and social services to escape, and recover from, the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual trauma associated with their victimization;

Whereas human traffickers use many physical and psychological techniques to control a victim, including—

(1) the use of violence or threats of violence against the victim or the family of the victim;

(2) isolation of the victim from the public;

(3) isolation of the victim from the family and religious or ethnic community of the victim;

(4) exploitation of language and cultural barriers;

(5) shame;

(6) control of the possessions of the victim;

(7) confiscation of the passport and other identification documents of the victim; and

(8) threats of arrest, deportation, or imprisonment if the victim attempts to reach out for assistance or to escape;

Whereas, although laws to prosecute perpetrators of human trafficking and to assist and protect victims of human trafficking and modern slavery, such as the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), title XII of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-4; 127 Stat. 136), the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-22; 129 Stat. 227), and the National Defense Au-

thorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2000), have been enacted in the United States, it is essential to increase public awareness, particularly amongst individuals who are most likely to come into contact with victims of human trafficking and modern slavery, regarding conditions and dynamics of human trafficking and modern slavery precisely because traffickers use techniques that are designed to severely limit self-reporting and evade law enforcement;

Whereas January 1 is the anniversary of the effective date of the Emancipation Proclamation;

Whereas February 1 is—

(1) the anniversary of the date on which President Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution sending the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to the States for ratification to forever declare that “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction”; and

(2) a date that has long been celebrated as “National Freedom Day”, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code; and

Whereas, under the authority of Congress to enforce the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States “by appropriate legislation”, Congress, through the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), updated the post-Civil War involuntary servitude and slavery statutes and adopted an approach of victim protection, vigorous prosecution, and prevention of human trafficking, commonly known as the “3P approach”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports—

(1) observing “National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month” during the period beginning on January 1, 2018, and ending on February 1, 2018, to recognize the vital role that the people of the United States have in ending human trafficking and modern slavery;

(2) marking the observation of “National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month” with appropriate programs and activities, culminating in the observance on February 1, 2018, of “National Freedom Day”, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code; and

(3) all other efforts to prevent, eradicate, and raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a resolution in observance of National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month, to bring awareness to the terrible scourge of modern slavery and human trafficking around the world.

In 2016 alone, the National Human Trafficking Hotline received 26,727 calls to report incidents of human trafficking in the United States. From those calls, 7,793 victims were identified. These individuals were trafficked across various sectors, economies, and geographical regions under conditions of force, fraud, or coercion.

The United States must not turn a blind eye to this scourge. The State Department estimates that 14,500 to 17,500 people are trafficked into the U.S. each year. Amongst federally identified trafficking victims in 2016, the top three countries of origin include the United States.

Importantly, more than a quarter of the trafficking cases identified by the

National Human Trafficking Hotline involved U.S. citizen victims. According to a recent study by Polaris, modern slavery and trafficking operates throughout a range of U.S. industries including our factories, our agricultural centers, as well as our hospitality and domestic work businesses.

We must all, as Americans, raise our awareness of this pernicious crime that often goes unnoticed and undetected in our communities.

Part of the reason it is undetected is that traffickers prey on vulnerable populations—like those in the juvenile justice system—and use numerous physical and psychological techniques to control their victims behind closed doors: isolating them from the public, exploiting language and cultural barriers, and threatening victims with violence.

These techniques are specifically designed to prevent victims from coming forward to authorities and they are extremely effective. This is why we must do better. We must do everything we can to raise public awareness so that we can all recognize the warning signs.

I have been heartened that in recent years, various private entities, such as hotels, the travel industry, and recently those in the convenience-store industry, have all come together to commit to training their employees to better detect human trafficking and modern slavery.

In addition to raising awareness, January is also a month to renew our commitment to enforce—and enact laws to help eradicate modern slavery and trafficking.

Back in 2000, Congress enacted the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, which marked a strong commitment to prosecute traffickers and better aid victims. This Congress, Judiciary Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY and I authored the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017, which was complemented by the Cornyn-Klobuchar Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017, to update our trafficking laws to better aid victims.

These bills passed the Senate in November, and the House should adopt these measures quickly so they can be signed into law.

Finally, in introducing today’s resolution, I would like to thank Senator GRASSLEY, Senator CORNYN, and Senator KLOBUCHAR for cosponsoring the resolution, and for all of their leadership in this area.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the Floor.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Abir Dhalimi, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges through August 31, 2018.

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

VETERAN PARTNERS' EFFORTS TO ENHANCE REINTEGRATION ACT

On Thursday, January 25, 2018, the Senate passed S. 1873, as amended, as follows:

S. 1873

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 "Veteran Partners' Efforts to Enhance Reintegration Act" or the "Veteran PEER Act".

SEC. 2. PROGRAM ON ESTABLISHMENT OF PEER SPECIALISTS IN PATIENT ALIGNED CARE TEAM SETTINGS WITHIN MEDICAL CENTERS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a program to establish not fewer than two peer specialists in patient aligned care teams at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs to promote the use and integration of services for mental health, substance use disorder, and behavior health in a primary care setting.

(b) TIMEFRAME FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall carry out the program at medical centers of the Department as follows:

(1) Not later than December 31, 2018, at not fewer than 25 medical centers of the Department.

(2) Not later than December 31, 2019, at not fewer than 50 medical centers of the Department.

(c) SELECTION OF LOCATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall select medical centers for the program as follows:

(A) Not fewer than five shall be medical centers of the Department that are designated by the Secretary as polytrauma centers.

(B) Not fewer than ten shall be medical centers of the Department that are not designated by the Secretary as polytrauma centers.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In selecting medical centers for the program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider the feasibility and advisability of selecting medical centers in the following areas:

(A) Rural areas and other areas that are underserved by the Department.

(B) Areas that are not in close proximity to an active duty military installation.

(C) Areas representing different geographic locations, such as census tracts established by the Bureau of the Census.

(d) GENDER-SPECIFIC SERVICES.—In carrying out the program at each location selected under subsection (c), the Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) the needs of female veterans are specifically considered and addressed; and

(2) female peer specialists are made available to female veterans who are treated at each location.

(e) ENGAGEMENT WITH COMMUNITY PROVIDERS.—At each location selected under subsection (c), the Secretary shall consider ways in which peer specialists can conduct outreach to health care providers in the community who are known to be serving veterans to engage with those providers and veterans served by those providers.

(f) REPORTS.—

(1) PERIODIC REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 180 days thereafter until the Secretary determines that the program is being carried out at the last location to be selected under subsection (c), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the program.

(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall, with respect to the 180-day period preceding the submittal of the report, include the following:

(i) The findings and conclusions of the Secretary with respect to the program.

(ii) An assessment of the benefits of the program to veterans and family members of veterans.

(iii) An assessment of the effectiveness of peer specialists in engaging under subsection (e) with health care providers in the community and veterans served by those providers.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the Secretary determines that the program is being carried out at the last location to be selected under subsection (c), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report detailing the recommendations of the Secretary as to the feasibility and advisability of expanding the program to additional locations.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 101, which was received from the House.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 101) providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 101) was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 p.m. on Tuesday, January 30, 2018.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the resolution of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the traditional reading of Washington's Farewell Address take place on Monday, February 26, following the prayer and pledge; further, that Senator PETERS be recognized to deliver the address.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Stras nomination at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, January 30; and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2018

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, January 30; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Stras nomination; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m., and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Stras nomination.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANKFORD. 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, following the remarks of Senator CASEY.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. 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. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, tonight I rise to speak about two matters. The first is the issue of community health centers, which, of course, is a major issue for States across the country.

Millions of Americans get their healthcare through community health centers. I will mention it more than once—800,000 of them are in the State of Pennsylvania. As we come closer to working out bipartisan agreements on a whole range of issues that are ahead of us literally in the next 2 to 3 weeks, I hope there will be a strong consensus to provide a funding plan and funding certainty to community health centers across the country.

These community health centers provide access to healthcare through education, rehabilitation, preventive services, and direct care. These centers focus on meeting the very basic healthcare needs in a community. They provide critical services, especially for people in both urban areas and rural areas, where there are often limited options for primary care and prevention clinics.

Despite the critical importance of these health centers, Congress failed to act to extend the majority of funding for community health centers before it ran out on September 30, 2017. After funds expired, the health centers were facing a funding reduction of between 60 percent and 70 percent of their funding.

Last December, Congress passed a continuing resolution that included \$550 million in funding for community health centers. That is nowhere near what they need to get through even 1 year. While this funding patch will provide some short-term relief, the funds do not provide the long-term funding stability for health centers that they need and that the patients who depend upon them should have a right to expect.

It is time for Congress to end the delays and get a long-term funding plan in place for these community health centers by the next deadline for the continuing resolution for funding, which is, of course, February 8. Because there is a deadline, it does give us the chance to work toward that date, to get funding in place by the 8th.

Across the United States, health centers serve more than 25 million patients per year. That is about 1 in 13 Americans overall. Consider this: I live in a State where we have 67 counties, but 48 of the 67 are so-called rural counties. That is the way they are categorized. There are a lot of healthcare needs in those rural communities and rural counties. Health centers provide care to one in four rural Americans. If that ratio were applied to Pennsylvania—we have at least 3 million people who live in rural communities. You can see the numbers. Hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvanians in rural areas depend upon healthcare from these community health centers.

In terms of the centers themselves, in 2016, Pennsylvania had 264, and that meant there were thousands of people working in those health centers. There are close to 5,000—above 4,900 Pennsylvanians who work in these centers. These health centers provide quality

care and vital services, as I said before, to a total of 800,000 Pennsylvanians—rural, urban, and otherwise.

To give you a sense of some of the testimony I received from people in our State, one story came from Emily, who works at the Family Practice and Counseling Network, a location I just visited today in Philadelphia. She wrote this letter to me a number of weeks ago. I won't read the whole excerpt, but this is what she said in pertinent part about the people who are served by these community health centers:

They have lives filled with trauma and in turn suffer from social, physical, and behavioral issues that will go untreated if funding for [community health centers] goes away . . . our services are so needed.

The words I want people to remember are "lives filled with trauma." That is, unfortunately, a good description of the lives led by a lot of Americans when healthcare—in this case, a community health care center—is not there for them or when healthcare itself is threatened. "Lives filled with trauma."

Another person who works at the same place and who has been the leader of this particular institution, the Family Practice and Counseling Network in Philadelphia, is the executive director, Donna Torrisi. I met her just today. She sent me a letter prior to today about her concerns. She is concerned about the funding cliff resulting in a barrier to care for people who need mental health services that are critically important. Donna said in pertinent part:

The impact on our community will be devastating. Our health center provides behavioral health services that are already limited in Philadelphia. Without funding, we'll need to close a site and cut jobs, causing patients to go without the care they desperately need.

For purposes of this debate, I would consider that expert testimony on community health centers because I know that in Donna's case, she has worked in this field something on the order of 25 years. We appreciate her weighing in on this.

I know there is concern on both sides of the aisle on this issue. I hope that concern results in a bipartisan agreement to fund community health centers to at least—and I would like to do a lot more, but at least give some funding certainty for the next year, meaning from now until the end of the fiscal year. I hope we can get an agreement that would give funding certainty for 2 years or more. That would be ideal.

HONORING DEPUTY MARSHAL CHRISTOPHER DAVID HILL

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I want to spend a couple of moments tonight—I know the hour is late for the Senate and people working here, but I want to end the night with a message about a law enforcement official in Pennsylvania whose memorial service I at-

tended on Friday. This individual was a deputy marshal. His name is Christopher David Hill. He lost his life on January 18. He was living at the time in York, PA. He was killed in the line of duty in Harrisburg—not far from York—while attempting to apprehend a fugitive.

I commend Deputy Marshal Hill for his service to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and his service to our Nation. He happened to be working in the Middle District of Pennsylvania, which meant he had responsibility for work through counties from the bottom of the State all the way up to Northeastern Pennsylvania, which is my home area.

I offer our deepest condolences to his family. Law enforcement officers like Christopher Hill accept the special duty of protecting the rest of us and keeping our communities safe. I have to say that we often don't think about that in the context of Federal marshals who do critically important work every day of the week and are often in horrifically dangerous circumstances.

In this case with Deputy Marshal Hill, the murderer was shooting from a higher position in a house. They didn't know this individual was in the house. He was shooting down at him. He had protective gear on. I won't give a full description because I am not qualified to do that, but the problem is the bullet came from a direction like this and entered his body from above and killed him even though he had protection on and all the proper protocols were followed. It was, in essence, a one-man ambush because they were trying to apprehend another individual on the floor below where the assailant was. That is the kind of danger Federal marshals face every day of the week, and sometimes we don't realize it.

Chris and his loving family made the ultimate sacrifice for the Nation and for the people in Pennsylvania. For his bravery and the contribution of his family, who supported him, we are eternally grateful for that commitment to law enforcement and the country.

Christopher David Hill was born in Sacramento, CA, but he was raised in Central Pennsylvania. He graduated from Warrior Run High School. He served his country as a Ranger in the U.S. Army, where he was assigned to the prestigious 3rd Battalion. While in the Army, Chris earned many awards, including the Army Commendation Medal.

For the last 11 years, he served as a deputy U.S. marshal. He was a member of the agency's Special Operations Group, so-called SOG.

At the memorial service, there were lots of references to that Special Operations Group because members of that group were there to not only pay tribute to him but to speak about his life, to speak about his service and to speak about his character and his bravery in very moving testimonials. The Special Operations Group is a specially trained and highly disciplined tactical unit.

In 2012, Chris served on a SOG assignment in Afghanistan, for which he was recognized with a Director's Distinguished Group Award.

In 2014, he was instrumental in the capture of notorious cop killer Eric Frein. Eric Frein was the individual who killed a State police officer and also injured another State police officer. In this case, Chris commanded U.S. marshals, FBI agents, and State troopers in one of the largest rural man-hunts in recent American history.

Chris was known as a dedicated and extremely capable law enforcement officer, and his numerous awards are proof of that.

During his time at the Marshals Service, he received the FLETC Director's Leadership Award, a Special Act Award for Distinguished 300 Shooter, and a Special Act Award for achieving 95 percent weapons proficiency.

Christopher was described as the person you wanted to go through the door with, someone on whom you could completely rely. He was also known for his sense of humor and his positive outlook on life.

Outside of work, he enjoyed hunting and golfing with his friends and family, but most of all, Chris is known for his devotion to his family. Chris is survived by his devoted wife Sylvia, his loving son and daughter Travis and Ashlynn, his father John, his brother Joey, his sister-in-law Michala, and his sister Melinda. He was preceded in death by his mother Katherine.

As I mentioned before, on January 18, he was shot and killed in the line of duty. The U.S. Marshals Service apprehends approximately 100,000 fugitives

every year—100,000 every year—including the worst of the worst, violent felons whose capture makes our communities safer.

Also shot in this altercation were Kyle Pitts, a New York City police officer, and a Harrisburg police officer who took a bullet to his ballistic vest but was not injured. We are praying for Kyle Pitts' full recovery.

Last week, I joined law enforcement officers from around the country for the memorial service, as I mentioned. You could tell how Chris was loved and respected by the testimonials from those law enforcement officials. You can't see it from a distance, but this is a program from the memorial service. It has a list of those who spoke—I will not read all of them—and then it has Chris's biography, with a picture of him on the back.

I could go through virtually every name of the ones who spoke in tribute to Chris—friends of his who worked with him. I am not sure I have ever been to a more emotional and moving ceremony in my life, where you had speak from the podium, one after another, these dedicated law enforcement professionals who are as tough and as determined as any man can be. Each person was very, very emotional, overcome with emotion in some cases. I am not sure I will ever be at a ceremony that is as moving.

On a night like tonight, when we have a lot of debates and a lot of arguments on a range of issues, these are times we can come together to express not only condolences, not only tribute and appreciation but express, I think, what is the solidarity of our State and

the Nation in paying tribute to a fallen law enforcement official.

My colleague Senator TOOMEY and I were there together. There were also people from across the State who were there and Federal judges who serve in that district and Federal employees who worked with Christopher Hill. For so many reasons, we want to pay tribute to him tonight and express gratitude for his life of service and the commitment he made to the country, that he made to the Marshals Service, and that he made to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

We want to express our condolences to his wife Sylvia, to his family, and his children because of the dedicated way they supported him through all his years as a Federal marshal and as a law enforcement official.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:56 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, January 30, 2018, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 29, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

GREGORY E. MAGGS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS TO EXPIRE ON THE DATE PRESCRIBED BY LAW.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOUSTON METHODIST SUGAR LAND HOSPITAL RECEIVES NATIONAL RECOGNITION

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Surgical Intensive Care Unit (ICU) Department at Houston Methodist Sugar Land Hospital for earning a gold-level Beacon Award for Excellence.

The Beacon Award for Excellence, given by the American Association of Critical-Care Nurses recognizes caregivers in units that successfully improve patient outcomes using evidence-based care. Houston Methodist Sugar Land is one of only seven ICUs in Texas to receive this prestigious award. It serves as a role model to other hospitals striving for excellence in patient care.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second District of Texas, congratulations again to the Surgical ICU Department at Houston Methodist Sugar Land, Hospital for receiving a gold-level Beacon Award for Excellence. I thank them for their commitment to providing the best possible care for their patients.

IN RECOGNITION OF LEE COUNTY SHERIFF JAY JONES BEING NAMED ALABAMA'S SHERIFF OF THE YEAR

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Lee County Sheriff Jay Jones for being named Alabama's Sheriff of the Year by his peers at the Alabama Sheriffs Association.

Sheriff Jones began his law enforcement career with the Lee County Sheriff's Office in 1975 while a student at Auburn University. His first work assignment was in the jail as a corrections officer/communications operator and was later appointed to a road position as a deputy sheriff. He moved up the ranks over the years and was appointed as the Sheriff's Office Chief Investigator in command of the Investigations Division. Sheriff Jones was first elected Lee County Sheriff in 1998 and is currently in his fourth term.

His professional education and training includes the FBI National Academy (146th session), FBI Law Enforcement Executive Development Seminar (58th session), National Sheriff's Institute (Class 00-1), Southern Law Enforcement Executive Development Seminar (1999), and the United States Secret Service Dignitary Protection Seminar (2003). He also serves on the Law Enforcement advisory boards of the United States Attorney for the middle district of Alabama and the Alabama

Attorney General. He has served as a governor's appointee to the Advisory Committee on Women in Criminal Justice, the Alabama Crime Victims' Compensation Commission and the Alabama Local Government Records Commission.

Sheriff Jones currently serves on the boards of the United Way of Lee County, the Lee County Youth Development Center, the Lee County Emergency Communications District and the Domestic Violence Intervention Center. His professional memberships include the FBI National Academy Associates, the Police Futurists International, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Alabama Sheriffs Association, the Law Enforcement Executive Development Association, the Alabama Jail Association, the Alabama Peace Officers' Association and the Fraternal Order of Police Lodge Number 21. Sheriff Jones' civic involvement includes membership in the Auburn Rotary Club and the Bleeker Puritan Club.

Along with his public safety duties Sheriff Jones has also served as an adjunct instructor of Criminal Justice at Auburn University and Southern Union Community College in Opelika.

The Sheriff of the Year honor was awarded during the 2018 Alabama Sheriffs convention for his outstanding professionalism, dedication and leadership while serving and protecting his community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Sheriff Jay Jones and thanking him for his years of public safety service.

RECOGNIZING TOM DANLEY

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Tom Danley for his outstanding and unparalleled service in my district.

Mr. Danley attended California State University, Long Beach where he received his undergraduate and graduate degrees. He first started as a Physical Education Teacher in 1959 at Lynwood High School, now Anaheim High School, and finally Katella High school as a director and coach.

Mr. Danley has coached Varsity Basketball for 33 years at Katella High School, where he led Katella to win 14 league championships and win a staggering 618 games. For 50 years, Mr. Danley has continuously been recognized for his surreal accomplishments including the following: induction into the Southern California Basketball Coaches Hall of Fame, "Basketball Coach of the Decade", and CIF/SS All-star Game Coach, and State Athletic Director of the Year in California, just to name a few.

In addition to serving as Katella's Basketball Coach and Athletic Director, he has also served as President to the Southern California Interscholastic Basketball Coaches Associa-

tion, was the President to the Orange County Athletic Directors' Association, and was the President of the California State Athletic Directors' Association.

Mr. Danley is a prime example of an extraordinary individual who has gone above and beyond for his community. His expertise, compassion, enthusiasm, and charisma will forever be remembered by those he mentored, coached, and led. He has left us with a legacy that will be the next stepping stone for those to follow.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Danley has been an outstanding role model for his community, and especially for young people. I am proud to be represent Mr. Danley. I hope he continues to be a source of knowledge, expertise and leadership for his community.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS ON FEBRUARY 16, 2018

HON. KATHLEEN M. RICE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 150th Anniversary of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks on February 16, 2018.

Founded on February 16, 1868, in New York City by Charles Algernon Sidney Vivian and a handful of friends, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is an exceptional American fraternal society dedicated to serving and caring for our citizens, communities, and country. That small band of friends has grown to include nearly 1,000,000 Elk members and 2,000 lodges nationwide.

For the last 150 years, the Elks have dedicated themselves to the ideals of charity, justice, and patriotism—investing millions of dollars and service hours each year to build stronger communities, assist homeless veterans, provide academic scholarships, and empower kids to avoid drugs. We should all be incredibly grateful for the time, money, and resources the Elks have committed to serve our neighbors in need, especially members of the military, veterans, youth, and disaster-stricken communities.

In recognition of the 150th anniversary of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, let's honor the valor, commitment, patriotism, and sacrifice that the Elks have displayed throughout its history and express appreciation for their dedicated service to our country.

TAIWAN'S AVIATION ROUTES

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States has long maintained an important and

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

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

strategic partnership with Taiwan. As our tenth largest trading partner and a critical geopolitical counterbalance to Chinese expansionism, Taiwan deserves the full attention of our government.

On January 4, 2018, China's civil aviation authority unilaterally announced that it would activate four air routes along its southeast coast near Taiwan, consisting of the M503 route and three east-west extension routes. These new air routes endanger aviation safety and threaten the delicate cross-strait status quo between China and Taiwan. China's newly declared air routes also violate International Civil Aviation Organization regulations and international norms. This unilateral action risks stoking instability in an already tense region and demonstrates China's bullying behavior towards its smaller neighbors.

Our relationship with Taiwan is crucial for preserving Taipei's independence and maintaining the beacon of liberty in East Asia. We are Taiwan's largest foreign investor and third largest trading partner. Over the years, the United States has provided Taiwan with billions of dollars in defense equipment to deter repeated Chinese aggression. Let us not forget that China is not a free society and has for decades aspired to subjugate Taiwan to its communist rule.

If we do not challenge Chinese unilateral action at each juncture, Beijing's influence, military power, and economic might are sure to dominate the region—dimming the prospect of freedom for millions. Our allies in the region and our strategic interests are threatened by China's campaign of expansion. Right now, Taiwan and the greater region look to the United States to check the aggressive, communist regime in China. China's incursion on Taiwanese air routes echoes its seizure of international waters in the South China Sea as well as its territorial disputes with our Indian and Japanese allies.

The United States should act to restore consultations between Chinese and Taiwanese authorities regarding aviation routes. We should target a rollback of China's aviation routes to the status quo and allow Taiwan to negotiate for an agreement on this controversial airspace. Small and subtle incursions on Taiwan by China should not be mistaken as insignificant. They represent a larger Chinese strategy to intimidate neighbors and bend international order towards its will. We must stand firm with our allies and block Beijing's efforts to dominate the region. And that's just the way it is.

**COST ESTIMATE ON H.R. 4555, THE
DHS INTERAGENCY COUNTER-
TERRORISM TASK FORCE ACT OF
2017**

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, the following cost estimate for H.R. 4555, the DHS Interagency Counterterrorism Task Force Act of 2017, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office was not made available to the Committee at the time of filing of the legislative report.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
*Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4555, the DHS Interagency Counterterrorism Task Force Act of 2017.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Mark Grabowicz.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, *Director.*

Enclosure.

H.R. 4555—DHS INTERAGENCY
COUNTERTERRORISM TASK FORCE ACT OF 2017
As passed by the House of Representatives
on January 9, 2018

H.R. 4555 would authorize Customs and Border Protection in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to assign personnel to participate in overseas interagency task forces to combat the threat of terrorism. DHS is currently carrying out activities similar to those that would be authorized by the act; thus, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 4555 would not significantly affect spending by DHS.

Enacting H.R. 4555 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4555 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 4555 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Mark Grabowicz. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

**USS "PUEBLO" 50TH
ANNIVERSARY TRIBUTE**

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the capture of the USS *Pueblo* by North Korea so I rise today in honor of her crew members and their unwavering courage.

The USS *Pueblo* is an intelligence ship named after the city of Pueblo, located in Colorado's Third Congressional District. On January 23, 1968 she was attacked and captured by North Korean forces while sailing in international waters during the Cold War. The unlawful seizure of the USS *Pueblo* resulted in the imprisonment and torture of 82 of her crew members. Tragically, one crew member died during the seizure of the ship.

For 11 months, the crew was subjected to brutal torture at the hands of their North Korean captors. In recent years, survivors have recounted being forced to walk around the floor on their knees, holding chairs over their heads for long periods of time, being slapped, punched and hit with gun butts, and having firearms held to their heads with threats of death if they did not reveal classified information.

While the United States government was eventually able to negotiate the freedom of the crew members, unfortunately, the USS *Pueblo*

was never released by North Korea and remains in their possession. It sits in the Potong River in Pyongyang where it serves as propaganda for the North Korean government. The state of Colorado, Pueblo County, and Pueblo have all passed resolutions and proclamations requesting the return of the ship, but to no avail. I too would like to see our ship returned home.

In 1989, the United States government finally recognized the crew members' sacrifice and granted them Prisoner of War Medals. However, the public didn't truly become aware of the gruesome torture that the crew endured until 2012, when the National Security Agency released a classified report detailing the abuse and the loss of intelligence documents.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely thankful for the service of the crew members of the USS *Pueblo*. In the face of great adversity they survived brutal conditions, starvation, and torture, both physical and psychological. On behalf of Colorado's Third Congressional District I would like to express my deepest gratitude for their bravery. It is my great privilege to honor them and remember their sacrifice here today.

**CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT
OF POLICE CHIEF JOHN D.
MANDARINO**

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Monessen Police Chief John D. "Mando" Mandarino on his recent retirement from the Monessen Police Department in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania.

Chief Mandarino first joined the City of Monessen as a police officer in May, 1990. From that point on, John became a decorated officer within the local force and the State because of his leadership in helping combat the ongoing opioid crisis that his community and Pennsylvania faces. His dedication propelled him through the ranks, eventually he became Chief of the Department in June of 2013.

In 2003, Mandarino was presented with the Outstanding Police Performance Award from the Pennsylvania Narcotics Officers Association and an accommodation from the Pennsylvania Attorney General's Office for his work investigating and arresting three illegal drug dealers within the City. As his career continued, Mandarino became vital in arrests in both the City of Monessen and Westmoreland County. Not only is John respected amongst his peers on the force, he is also a respected member of the community where his heroism to the people of Monessen will never be forgotten.

Today I am honored to recognize John Mandarino for his exceptional law enforcement career and his many accomplishments. His impact on the community has been too great to put into words, and he has represented Western Pennsylvania and Westmoreland County with great distinction. May God continue to bless Chief Mandarino, his wife Kelly and son Gianni, and may he continue to bless all the men and women in the law enforcement community.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF STEPHEN MICHAEL BISTARKEY, SR.

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Stephen Michael Bistarkey, Sr. who passed away on January 7, 2018. He was 45 years old.

Stephen was born in Youngstown, Ohio on November 10, 1972 to Andrew E. and Darlene S. (Anderson) Bistarkey. He was a 1991 graduate of Howland High School and attended the Apostolic Bible Church. He worked in the Trumbull County maintenance department.

Stephen was known for being an avid fan of the Ohio State Buckeyes, the Cleveland Indians, and the Oakland Raiders. In his free time, he enjoyed camping and fishing. Above all, he cherished his time with his son Stephen.

He is survived by a son, Stephen Michael Bistarkey, Jr. of Niles, Ohio; mother Darlene S. (Frank) Fuda of Niles; two brothers, Andrew E. (Connie) Bistarkey, Jr. of Niles and Kenneth J. Bistarkey of Niles; stepsister, Tonya (Donald) Swauger of Mineral Ridge; two stepbrothers, Frank "Buddy" (fiancée Mandy) Fuda of Rowlett, Texas and Tony (Devon) Fuda of Niles and several nieces and nephews.

I extend my deepest condolences to Stephen's family and friends. I know he is deeply missed by his son and all who had the pleasure of knowing him.

FORT BEND COUNTY FIRE MARSHAL'S OFFICE RECOGNIZED FOR EXCELLENCE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fort Bend County Fire Marshal's Office for receiving the Texas Fire Marshals Association's (TxFMA) Achievement of Excellence Award and a Letter of Appreciation from the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement.

The Fort Bend County Fire Marshal's Office was recognized for their performance excellence in fire prevention. This achievement award is the only formal recognition for performance excellence of organizations given by the TxFMA. In addition, the Letter of Appreciation identifies the Fire Marshal's staff for their leadership as a TCOLE agency. Our community is safer because of the dedication of the first responders in the Fort Bend County Fire Marshal's Office. We thank them for their service and their sacrifice.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second District of Texas, congratulations again to the Fort Bend County Fire Marshal's Office for earning this distinction. I thank them for their commitment to keeping our community safe.

REMEMBERING "APOLLO 1," "CHALLENGER" AND "COLUMBIA"

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, "Sometimes when we reach for the stars we fall short," as President Reagan said. This time of year is difficult for the space community as we remember the 17 courageous astronauts lost to tragic incidents.

On January 27, 1967, Virgil Grissom, Ed White and Roger Chaffee were performing tests of the *Apollo 1* spacecraft at Cape Canaveral when a fire broke out. Desperate efforts to rescue them were too late.

On January 28, 1986, a crew of seven lifted off aboard the space shuttle *Challenger*. Michael Smith, Dick Scobee, Judith Resnik, Ronald McNair, Ellison Onizuka, Gregory Jarvis and teacher Christa McAuliffe. Seventy-three seconds after liftoff, all were lost when the *Challenger* exploded.

On February 1, 2003, Pilot William McCool and Commander Rick Husband guided the space shuttle *Columbia* back into earth's atmosphere along with crewmembers Michael Anderson, Laurel Clark, David Brown, Kalpana Chawla and Ilan Ramon. The shuttle broke up during reentry, taking the lives of all on board.

Let us remember these 17 brave pioneers "who made the ultimate sacrifice so others could reach for the stars."

HONORING TEMPLE SINAI IN SANDY SPRINGS

HON. KAREN C. HANDEL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mrs. HANDEL. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Temple Sinai in Sandy Springs, Georgia.

For 50 years now, Temple Sinai has served the reform Jewish community in Atlanta, Georgia.

In February of 1968, thirty people sat in on a meeting to discuss the formation of a Reform Jewish congregation in Atlanta. One month later, 145 families signed on as chapter members.

Today, 50 years since that first meeting, over 1,300 Georgians proudly call Temple Sinai home.

Senior Rabbi Ron Segal has been a member of the clergy at Temple Sinai since July 1996. As a board member of the Atlanta chapter of the American Jewish Committee and as an advisory board member of the William Breman Jewish Home, Rabbi Segal has shown a commitment to our city that extends well beyond the perimeter of Temple Sinai.

Mr. Speaker, Temple Sinai will have served our community for a full half century this February, and they continue to go above and beyond in their service to their neighbors.

From offering educational opportunities to serving as a center of Jewish life in Atlanta, I want to wish Temple Sinai 50 more years of continued success as a pillar of the Jewish community in Atlanta.

COMMEMORATING THE 2018 NATIONAL CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize all of the Catholic schools and parishes in the 18th District of Illinois and across the nation that will be participating in National Catholic Schools Week. This week, over seven thousand Catholic schools will host more than two million students to celebrate this year's theme: "Learn. Serve. Lead. Succeed."

The National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA) has proven extraordinary leadership and development with 99 percent of all students graduating high school and 85.7 percent go on to higher education. The NCEA's legacy of success is a testament to the quality education and guidance through faith that each student receives during their time at Catholic schools.

As a graduate of St. Anne Grade School in East Moline, Illinois and Spalding Catholic High School in Peoria, Illinois, it is my privilege to be an original co-sponsor of legislation that recognizes and supports National Catholic Schools Week. The education and religious values that these institutions instill serve as a strong foundation for a fulfilling relationship with God and inform our daily lives with lessons of faith.

I am thankful every day for the experiences and lessons that I have gained through my Catholic upbringing, and I am grateful that my three sons also attend Catholic schools that will prepare them to learn, serve, lead, and succeed like so many other children across the nation.

While we reflect this week on the impact that our schools have had on our spiritual growth, let us also recognize the contributions that the National Catholic Educational Association continually provides for our communities. Once again, I am pleased to commemorate National Catholic Schools Week and I look forward to many more years of continued success and celebration.

IN RECOGNITION OF WEAVE'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Women Escaping a Violent Environment (WEAVE) as it celebrates its 40th Anniversary. As the community gathers to honor this organization, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this nonprofit for its long history of service to the Sacramento region and beyond.

In 1978, WEAVE opened its first shelter to provide services and resources to survivors of domestic violence. It soon expanded its services to help sexual assault and human trafficking survivors through legal assistance, emergency shelters, crisis intervention, community prevention education programs, and a 24-hour support and information line. In its 40

years of operation, WEAVE has become a nationally recognized nonprofit renowned for its dedication to building a violence- and abuse-free community. WEAVE has been instrumental in helping the community better understand domestic violence, human trafficking, and sexual assault issues so we can work together to end the cycle of violence.

Over its decade of operation, WEAVE has partnered with Sacramento County, local law enforcement, the Commercially Sexually Exploited Children Court, Child Protective Services, and the Sacramento County District Attorney's Office to provide 24/7 response, outreach, and services to sex trafficking victims. In addition, WEAVE has recently worked with the California State Senate to provide resources to Senate employees who have experienced sexual misconduct. For its work both with these organizations and independently, WEAVE has been honored by the Nonprofit Resource Center, the U.S. Department of Justice, the Governor of California, the Human Rights Fair Housing Commission, the President of the United States, and many more. It is deserving of each of these accolades and I am proud to lend my own voice to praising WEAVE today.

Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to celebrate WEAVE. Through its work in my hometown, it is helping ensure that Sacramento and its surrounding regions are a community that does not tolerate domestic violence, sexual assault, or sex trafficking. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring WEAVE on its 40th anniversary and wishing the organization at least another 40 years of existence and success.

MADISON ELLIS CHOSEN AS TSTC
SGA PRESIDENT

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Missouri City native Madison Ellis for being named President of the Student Government Association.

Madison, 19 years old and in his first semester at TSTC, was named as the first ever SGA President for TSTC's Fort Bend County campus. He is very active in his community, volunteering with organizations like the Special Olympics, and has already implemented partnerships with businesses for student discounts and a local recycling center to help raise funds for his proposals. Thanks to his ambition, leadership, and commitment to serving his fellow students, Ellis is clearly an excellent President and a role model for future SGA presidents.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Madison Ellis for being chosen as President of the Student Government Association at TSTC's Fort Bend County campus. I thank him for his advocacy on behalf of his fellow students, and look forward to seeing what he will accomplish in the future.

IN HONOR OF TERRY & SHERRY
LOVVORN 50TH WEDDING ANNI-
VERSARY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50th wedding anniversary of Terry and Sherry Lovvorn on December 1, 2017.

John Terry Lovvorn and Sherry Lee Rogers were married December 1, 1967 at Shiloh Baptist Church in Graham, Alabama.

They made their home in the same house in Graham where Terry was born in 1946, and they still live in downtown Graham.

Terry has been a life-long farmer and was elected as Randolph County Commissioner in 2008. Sherry retired in 1998 after 25 years of teaching.

They were blessed with two children, Susan Rice and Joe Lovvorn (wife Jenifer) and are grandparents to Katie Rice, Luke Rice, Jackson Lovvorn and Landon Lovvorn.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the 50th wedding anniversary of Terry and Sherry Lovvorn.

COST ESTIMATE ON H.R. 4578, THE
COUNTER TERRORIST NETWORK
ACT

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, the following cost estimate for H.R. 4578, the Counter Terrorist Network Act, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office was not made available to the Committee at the time of filing of the legislative report.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4578, the Counter Terrorist Network Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Mark Grabowicz.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, *Director.*

Enclosure.

H.R. 4578—COUNTER TERRORIST NETWORK ACT
As passed by the House of Representatives
on January 11, 2018

H.R. 4578 would authorize Customs and Border Protection in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to assign personnel to other agencies to support partnerships for sharing global information to enhance border security. The act also would direct DHS to collaborate with other agencies to combat foreign terrorist organizations. DHS is currently carrying out activities similar to those that would be required by the act; thus, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 4578 would not significantly affect spending by DHS.

Enacting H.R. 4578 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4578 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 4578 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Mark Grabowicz. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

TRIBUTE TO THE ARMENIAN RE-
LIEF SOCIETY "MAYR" HOLLY-
WOOD CHAPTER

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Armenian Relief Society (ARS) "Mayr" Hollywood Chapter upon its one-hundredth anniversary.

The ARS "Mayr" Hollywood Chapter, named "Mayr" as the mother chapter in Southern California, has made many strides since its founding in 1918, including establishing an Armenian Center, helping numerous displaced persons from Armenian-populated camps in Germany to move to the United States following the Second World War, and providing aid to areas in Armenia, Artsakh and Javakhk. The ARS "Mayr" Hollywood Chapter became the inspiration for the inception of the Anahid Chapter in the San Fernando Valley and the Ani Chapter in Montebello, established in 1958 and 1960 respectively. In addition, the chapter founded the first ARS social service office in 1980, leading to the establishment of a network of more offices throughout the southland.

The ARS "Mayr" Hollywood Chapter has been a steadfast supporter of educating students and preserving the culture and language of the Armenian people through its Saturday School program at the Rose and Alex Pilibos Armenian School in Los Angeles. In addition to this program, the "Mayr" Chapter provides the Rose and Alex Pilibos Armenian School with financial support and student scholarships and collaborated with the school to open the Rose and Alex Pilibos ARS "Mayr" Chapter Mary Postojan Armenian Preschool in 1992.

The time, effort, and care that the ARS "Mayr" Hollywood Chapter has given to the community is outstanding, and the Armenian-American residents of Los Angeles have benefited greatly from their dedicated work.

I ask all Members to join with me in commending the ARS "Mayr" Hollywood Chapter for one-hundred years of committed service to the Los Angeles community.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVER-
SARY OF CHILDREN'S MUSICAL
THEATER SAN JOSE

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Children's Musical Theater San Jose (CMT) and commemorate its 50th Anniversary Season. Founded as an afterschool

program in 1968 by John P. Healey at Saint Frances Cabrini School in San Jose, CMT is the oldest performing arts institution in San Jose.

Since its foundation, CMT has followed its mission of using musical theater to educate and nurture the young people in our community to get involved with art and theater at a young age. Indeed, CMT has grown from a grassroots volunteer organization to one of the largest theatrical training and performing organizations of its kind in the nation. CMT's 50 seasons have engaged around 50,000 performers and so far staged 364 productions.

As the leading youth theater in our community, CMT offers classes and camps to children as young as four years old and performance opportunities to children as young as six. Indeed, CMT offers invaluable experiences through theater to children between four and 20 years old, casting all who audition for its youth theater productions and awarding scholarships to some participants in their fee-based programs.

CMT has thrived as an invaluable artistic organization in our community, receiving 10 awards for artistic excellence from the National Endowment for the Arts. Its artistic vision, under the direction of Kevin R. Hauge since 1996, has helped to bring hundreds of thousands of performance arts patrons to Downtown San Jose, contributing to the cultural renaissance and development and economic vitality of our city.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor Children's Musical Theater San Jose for its 50 years of extraordinary contributions to the cultural arts community in our city and its sustained leadership in the development of the young members of our community.

LANE PEARSON NAMED
OUTSTANDING REALTOR FOR 2017

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lane Pearson for being named the Houston Association of Realtors/Fort Bend County Outstanding Realtor for 2017.

Lane Pearson, of Better Homes and Gardens Real Estate Gary Greene, was recognized for her leadership and support of the Fort Bend County Realtor community. Not only has Lane demonstrated great leadership professionally, but she has also served in many volunteer leadership roles to improve our Fort Bend community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Lane Pearson for being named the Houston Association of Realtors/Fort Bend County Outstanding Realtor for 2017. I thank her for her enduring commitment to making Fort Bend County a great place to live.

HONORING JOHN A. HOBBS IN
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my good friend, John A. Hobbs, on the occasion of his 90th birthday. He is simply one of the most amazing men I have ever known.

A native Nashvillian, John A. has lived a life for the storybooks and he's still going strong. He's worked hard all of his life, for example delivering telegrams to the Tennessee Governor's Mansion when he was just a young man during the Depression. I am confident that there was never a better delivery boy than John A. Hobbs. That's why he was chosen to go to the Governor's residence.

As an adult, he saw Nashville's promise long before anyone else, and understood the impact that country music, Opryland, and tourism could have on our city. He has invested his heart and soul into helping Nashville and Middle Tennessee live up to its potential. Nashville is now one of the hottest cities in America due, in part, to John A.'s foresight and energy.

You can read about many of the extraordinary things John A. has done for Middle Tennessee in the excellent book, "The Life and Times of Music Valley's Visionary."

John A. is a devout Catholic and dedicated family man with a large and talented extended family. He built many businesses with his four sons and grandsons over the years, and has developed some of Music City's most iconic attractions for both tourists and lifelong residents.

Despite John A.'s success, he never lost touch with his roots, his childhood friends, and his neighbors. Nobody loves Donelson and its people more than he does.

I particularly love John A.'s lively monthly breakfasts that bring the whole community together and where Nashvillians go to be seen. Where are they held? At the night spot named "John A.'s," of course. You simply cannot win an election in Davidson County unless you are a regular attendee.

I wish John A. Hobbs the happiest of 90th birthdays. He is a truly kind, generous, and wise man. The United States of America, the greatest nation on earth, was built by men like John A. Hobbs, members of the greatest generation.

I am proud to call him my friend.

RECOGNIZING NOAH MCMOYLER
FOR HIS TALENT AND DETERMINATION

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Noah McMoyler of Dublin, California, for his amazing talent and unwavering determination that led to his recent selection and performances as a contestant on NBC's "The Voice."

Better known by his stage name, "Noah Mac," this Dublin High School senior is truly a

self-taught musician, though he got his start in the most heartbreaking way. When Noah was seven years old, his 19-year-old sister, Stevie—a big inspiration to him—lost her battle with brain cancer. Stevie loved music, which inspired Noah to sing one of her favorite songs at her funeral. He shocked his family and friends with the clarity and quality of his voice.

In the years that followed, Noah spent a great deal of his time teaching himself piano, guitar, and drums, and writing and recording music in a studio he built himself in his family's backyard shed.

Noah quickly gained local attention after his performances at local cafes and school talent shows, and he also starred as Benny in Dublin High School's successful 2016 production of Lin-Manuel Miranda's musical "In the Heights."

In 2017, Noah released his first EP, "Light," and months later, his blind audition for "The Voice" blew the judges away.

With performances of songs including "In the Air Tonight," "Hold Back the River," "Speed of Sound" and "Ordinary World," Noah warmed the nation's heart and made his family, friends and neighbors extremely proud.

Noah, now 18, describes his passion for the musical process: waking up with a melody in his head, writing lyrics, composing, arranging, and bringing the song to life in production. For him, he says, every song is like a unique painting full of color and meaning.

Noah's unrelenting drive and the beautiful music he creates are an inspiration to his fellow students, his neighbors in our 15th Congressional District, and now to the entire nation.

I am honored to count Noah among my constituents, and I wish him even bigger successes in the future.

NEEDVILLE VOLLEYBALL PLAYERS
EARN STATEWIDE RECOGNITION

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Needville High School Girls Volleyball Team for their fifth state championship and for the impressive awards team members received from the Texas Sports Writers Association (TXSWA), Texas Association of Volleyball Coaches (TAVC) and Texas Girls Coaches Association (TGCA).

The team, led by TXSWA and TAVC Coach of the Year Amy Schultz, had a remarkable 43–6 season, culminating in their fifth state championship. Anna Gadway was voted TXSWA 4A Player of the Year. She was also named state tournament MVP and made the TAVC and TGCA all-state teams. Sydney Sacra was voted TAVC 4A MVP, earned TXSWA first-team all-state honors and made the TGCA all-state and all-academic teams. Kaitlyn Kovarcik was a TXSWA first-team selection, TAVC all-state honoree and TGCA all-state academic scholar. Hayden Smyers made the TXSWA second team, as well as the TAVC and TGCA all-state squads. Janssen Cain, Kailey Labay and Peyton Sulak made the TGCA all-state academic list.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Needville High School Girls Volleyball team. I look forward to seeing what these talented young ladies will be able to accomplish in the future.

HONORING JULIUS LESTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable person, Mr. Julius Lester.

In the summer of 1964, better known as the Freedom Summer of 1964, Julius Lester traveled to Mississippi to register African-Americans to vote, while documenting the Civil Rights Movement through photographs. Lester also is known for assembling Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s notes while he was imprisoned in the Birmingham jail that became the famous "Letter from Birmingham Jail." His work to inform the public of the Civil Rights Movement is appreciated and admired to this very day.

In 1961, Lester went on to serve as the executive director of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference until 1964. He authored over 40 books during his lifetime and received prestigious honors for his work; such as the New York Times Outstanding Book Award, the Boston Globe-Horn Book Award and many others. Lester also served as a professor at the University of Massachusetts for over 30 years.

Today, we mourn the death of Julius Lester. As a prominent figure, he managed to provoke thought in all of those who he came in contact with either in person or through his work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life and legacy of Mr. Julius Lester.

IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I co-sponsored H. Res. 621, Impeaching Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, of high crimes and misdemeanors. After I co-sponsored this legislation, I sent the following letter to the people of Minnesota's Fourth District:

For my constituents and for history, I want to be on the record supporting an open, transparent process of Congressional investigations, subpoenas, and impeachment proceedings to hold President Trump accountable for actions that are corrupting the Presidency and damaging our nation. To that end, I am co-sponsoring H. Res. 621, Articles of Impeachment Against President Donald Trump.

Congress has the Constitutional obligation to examine the mounting evidence that President Trump has repeatedly obstructed the criminal investigation into Russia's state-sponsored effort to influence the 2016 presidential election. The recent revelation that the president attempted to fire the lead investigator, Special Counsel Robert

Mueller, further underscores the President's obstruction of justice.

The investigation into acts of collusion or conspiracy between the Trump campaign and Russia is legitimate and has resulted in two campaign officials, including President Trump's former National Security Advisor, pleading guilty to federal crimes. President Trump's numerous attempts to prevent, obstruct, or impede justice demand action by Congress to hold him accountable.

In addition to his obstruction of justice, President Trump's use of his office to profit personally from outside business interests should be unacceptable to all Americans. President Trump continues to own and influence a global empire of properties and brands for personal profit in direct violation of the Constitution's Foreign and Domestic Emoluments Clauses.

The scope and scale of President Trump's family business dealings and foreign entanglements is unknown, demanding a thorough examination. Unlike other recent presidents, President Trump has refused to publically release his tax returns or place his business holdings in blind trust. Never before in the history of our nation has a President created a potential for such profound and rampant corruption.

It is obvious that Congress must investigate a president who repeatedly obstructs a criminal investigation and appears to be personally profiting from the Presidency. Unfortunately, the Republican-controlled Congress is more interested in covering up for President Trump and protecting itself politically than in conducting a meaningful investigation that provides real accountability for the American people.

As a Member of Congress, I must uphold the Constitution. My support for impeachment is rooted in a belief that no president is above the law. Impeachment is the appropriate Constitutional mechanism available to Congress in the event of extreme actions by the President that violate the Constitution, flout our laws, and undermine the trust of Americans.

President Trump is the only person responsible for the predicament that he has brought on himself and our country. But it will take action on the part of Congress and the American people to stop the damage that he is causing and to begin to heal our country. My co-sponsorship of H. Res. 621 is a critical step in that effort.

DR. ART KLAWITTER NAMED 2017 PHYSICIAN OF THE YEAR

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Art Klawitter of Memorial Hermann Medical Group Needville for being named the 2017 Physician of the Year by the Harris County Academy of Family Physicians (HCAFP).

This prestigious award recognizes a medical professional who spends at least half of his or her time in active practice or family practice education. Dr. Klawitter has been practicing medicine in Needville for 36 years, and has dedicated his career to advancing the health and wellbeing of his patients. In addition to his work as a board-certified family physician, he has served in multiple organizations that promote health care at the state and national level. He served as the secretary and treas-

urer for the Texas Medical Association and was a state delegate to the American Medical Association House of Delegates.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Dr. Art Klawitter for being named the Harris County Academy of Family Physicians 2017 Physician of the Year. I thank him for his commitment to keeping the Needville community healthy.

HONORING MARVIN HILL OF DIERKS, ARKANSAS

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to recognize a true American hero. Marvin Hill of Dierks, Arkansas, is a 103-year-old veteran of World War II. On Tuesday, January 30, the Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System will recognize Mr. Dierks with a commemorative coin in honor of his service and sacrifice on behalf of the United States.

I ask the people of Arkansas to join the VA and myself in honoring Mr. Dierks and thanking him for fighting in defense of freedom.

IN HONOR OF THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF BENJAMIN RUSSELL

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 80th birthday of Benjamin Russell.

Mr. Russell is the Chairman of Russell Lands, Inc. He is married to Luanne Radney Russell and has one daughter, Adelia (Dedie) Russell Hendrix.

Mr. Russell started working summer jobs at Russell Corporation, a large textile firm in Alabama that was founded by his grandfather in 1902. He attended Mercer University and the University of Alabama and served in the Air National Guard—280th ANG, Maxwell Air Force Base. After college and active duty training in the Air National Guard, he was employed by Russell Corporation as a management trainee.

In 1970, he became president of Russell Lands, Inc., a private company owned by the Russell family. Russell Lands, Inc. had previously been a land and timber company, but has since become a diverse organization with more than 500 employees and is recognized as Alabama's largest recreational development company.

Mr. Russell is a member of the Business Council of Alabama, Alexander City Area Chamber of Commerce, First United Methodist Church and Willow Point Golf and Country Club.

Mr. Russell has been recognized for many honors and awards including: Alabama Humanities Award 2016; Heart of the House Award given by Ronald McDonald House Charities of Alabama—2010; The Children's Advocate Award/Margie Curry Lifetime

Achievement Award—2009; Inducted into The Alabama Business Hall of Fame—2008; Indian Springs School's Outstanding Alumnus of the Year—2003; CARE Philanthropist of the Year—2000; Member, Alabama Academy of Honor—1997; Outstanding Philanthropist in Alabama—1994; First CARE World Humanitarian Award—1990; Alexander City Man of the Year—1975.

Mr. Russell turned 80 on January 18, 2018.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in wishing Mr. Russell a very happy 80th birthday.

IN RECOGNITION OF SACRAMENTO'S BUSINESS LEADERS

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the many outstanding business leaders in California's Capital Region being honored at the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce's 123rd annual dinner and business awards ceremony. Those being honored are dedicated to the success of the region and have worked tirelessly to advance its economic vitality. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring these fine Sacramentans, and in thanking the Sacramento Metro Chamber for its tireless efforts to promote business in northern California.

Winnie Comstock-Carlson, President and Publisher of Comstock's Magazine, is Sacramentan of the Year. Mrs. Comstock-Carlson's leadership at the magazine and in the community has served the greater Sacramento region for 28 years. Additionally, she has served on the Metro Chamber board and has been involved in numerous regional non-profit charitable organizations.

Shannon Deary-Bell, President and CEO of Nor-Cal Beverage, is Businesswoman of the Year. Mrs. Deary-Bell is a strong leader in the Sacramento business community. Her service and support of the American Heart Association and many other charitable organizations has not gone unnoticed by the community.

Rick Niello, President of The Niello Company, is Businessman of the Year. Mr. Niello's work as a community leader and humanitarian has had a great impact on the Sacramento region for many years. The Niello Company supports over 40 local charities and non-profit organizations in its philanthropic efforts.

F&M Bank is being inducted into the Centennial Business Hall of Fame. F&M Bank has been providing financial services to individuals, families, and businesses in California for over 100 years. The bank's longevity is a testament to the high quality service and security it continues to provide to Californians.

East Lawn Memorial Parks and Mortuaries and Sacramento International Airport are both being inducted into the Business Hall of Fame. East Lawn has been an exceptional Sacramento business for over 110 years, establishing deep roots in our community's history. East Lawn's pristine service and care of beloved family and friends who have passed on strengthens community bonds. Sacramento International Airport has been serving Sacramento for over 50 years. In 2011 the airport opened the impressive new Terminal B, which has brought great pride and convenience to

the people of Sacramento and the many travelers visiting our region.

Digital Deployment and GNT Solutions are the dual recipients of the Small Business of the Year Award. Digital Deployment opened in Sacramento 13 years ago. Its care for its employees and customers is second to none, which is proven by their impressive success and growth. Its CEO Mac Clemmens is a native Sacramentan and a leader among Sacramento's young up-and-coming CEOs. GNT Solutions has been helping local Sacramento businesses with technology troubles for 14 years. Its experienced team continues to provide its customers with friendly and effective service, allowing businesses to run smoothly and free of IT issues.

Cassandra Jennings, CEO and President of the Greater Sacramento Urban League, is the recipient of this year's Al Geiger Memorial Award. Mrs. Jennings's passion for community development and the lives of the people that live in the Sacramento region is remarkable. Mrs. Jennings is carrying on Mr. Geiger's legacy by serving as a role model who helps inspire others to leadership in service to our region.

Erica Taylor, Vice President of Communications and Community Relations for the Golden 1 Credit Union, is the Volunteer of the Year. Her work over the past two years has played a major part in Golden 1 Credit Union's success as a business and as a partner of our beloved Sacramento Kings.

Jennifer Ablog, Community and Government Relations Manager for Kaiser Permanente, is this year's Young Professional of the Year. Born, raised, and educated in Sacramento, Ms. Ablog is proud to call Sacramento her home. Her dedicated work for Kaiser Permanente has certainly improved the health of the Sacramento community.

Veronika Monell of JumpStart Now is Ambassador of the Year. Mrs. Monell has been praised for her honest and passionate work with small businesses in the Sacramento region. The innovative ideas she brings promotes a progressive Sacramento, helping our businesses lead in the modern economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize these individuals and businesses for their contributions to the Sacramento region that I love. I ask all my colleagues to join me in commending them for their unwavering commitment to Sacramento.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF KATHLEEN DEPIERO

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Kathleen DePiero who passed away unexpectedly on Saturday, December 30, 2017 after a brief illness.

Kathleen graduated from Parkersburg High School and received a degree in journalism from the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism at Ohio University. She was an Emmy Award winning television reporter and anchor, which included stops in Parkersburg, West Virginia, Charlotte, North Carolina, and Cleveland, Ohio. Known for her captivating storytelling and being a natural on camera, Kathleen was

well respected and admired by her colleagues. Kathleen was also a loving mother to two children, Blake and Hadley. She wanted to be there for every aspect of their lives, every single day. Kathleen treasured her time at her family's lake house and her parent's home in Hilton Head Island. She was the happiest surrounded by family and close friends.

Kathleen was known for describing herself as a: Daughter, Sister, Wife, Mother, Friend, Cousin, Aunt, Colleague, Head Room Mom, Hillary lover, Country Music Fan, Book Worm, Wine Aficionado, Half Marathoner, KI Girl, Dog Mom, FFLOP, Happy Hour Connoisseur, SIL, Paddle Boarder, Staunch Democrat, Backstage Dance Mom, Reporter, Supper Clubber, Singer, Work Out Enthusiast, Impersonator, Traveler, Dancer, Hallmark Christmas Movie Watcher, Royal Family Follower, Weather Reporter Wannabe, Granddaughter, Katie Couric Stalker, Mountaineer, Bobcat Girl, AOTT Sister, aka Deeeelores, DIL, Chicken and Biscuit Consumer, Essential Oil Guru, Carpooler, Emmy Award Winner, Yogi, Beachcomber, Cookbook Collector, Salty Dog Frequenter, and so much more.

Kathleen had an infectious laugh that will live in our hearts forever. I know she is deeply missed by her friends and family. I extend my deepest and sincerest condolences.

HONORING UNITY PERFORMING ARTS FOUNDATION

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Unity Performing Arts Foundation of Fort Wayne, Indiana, along with its CEO and founder, Marshall White. Since 2000, Unity Performing Arts has focused on empowering and developing young men and women in the areas of artistry, character, and leadership. Through faith based community programming, young Hoosiers learn values that last a lifetime.

The Expressions Creative Writing program creates an avenue for students to express themselves through pen and paper, and the Voices of Unity Choir holds all participants to a standard of excellence, both on and off the stage. Nearly 18 years later, programs of the Unity Performing Arts Foundation continue to be successful in developing young leaders in our community.

Unity Performing Arts Foundation has truly had a meaningful impact on northeast Indiana, and I wish this important program continued success.

COST ESTIMATE ON H.R. 4433, THE SECURING DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FIREARMS ACT OF 2017

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, the following cost estimate for H.R. 4433, the Securing Department of Homeland Security Firearms Act

of 2017, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office was not made available to the Committee at the time of filing of the legislative report.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL McCaul,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4433, the Securing DHS Firearms Act of 2017.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Mark Grabowicz.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL, *Director*.

Enclosure.

H.R. 4433—SECURING DHS FIREARMS ACT OF 2017

As passed by the House of Representatives on January 9, 2018

H.R. 4433 would require the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to improve the security and accountability for firearms and other sensitive assets controlled by the department (such as badges worn by certain DHS personnel). The department is currently carrying out activities similar to those that would be required by the act; thus, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 4433 would not significantly affect DHS spending.

Enacting H.R. 4433 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4433 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 4433 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Mark Grabowicz. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CREATIVITY SHELL RAISES AWARENESS FOR HUMAN TRAF- FICKING

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is a menace to our society and should be eradicated as soon as possible. Fortunately, we have outstanding organizations brave enough to stand up for those who have been subjected to the horror of modern day slavery. I am honored to recognize one of those great organizations today. Creativity Shell is a nonprofit located in Houston, Texas whose mission is to use creative trades to educate and inspire the next generation of makers. The organization teaches valuable skills like sewing and textile arts to students in public libraries, schools and shelters that rescue children from human trafficking. Creativity Shell is now launching "Hearts for a Fresh Start" to give back and raise awareness for trafficked victims. The program invites Houston kids to help sew hearts on washcloths.

The washcloths will be delivered to children in shelters who have been rescued from human trafficking. This great program was launched on January 14th and will run until

Valentine's Day. Creativity Shell's goal is to make and deliver over 5,000 washcloths to shelters all over the country. As a longtime advocate of combatting human trafficking, I applaud Creativity Shell for their passion, dedication and unwavering support of trafficked victims. It's time for us to stand together. End this scourge on society and support and protect those who have fallen prey to human trafficking. And that's just the way it is.

DR. SARFRAZ ALY NAMED PHYSICIAN OF THE YEAR

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Sarfraz Aly for being named OakBend Medical Center's 2017 Physician of the Year.

Dr. Aly was awarded this honor thanks to his 14 years of experience and reputation for kindness and sincerity appreciated by patients and staff alike. The Physician of the Year award is OakBend's highest recognition, and honors the physician who demonstrates significant skill, along with genuine compassion for both patients and coworkers.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Dr. Aly for being named OakBend Medical Center's 2017 Physician of the Year. We all benefit from his commitment to quality healthcare, and I thank him for his dedication to keep Houstonians healthy.

TRIBUTE TO THE VAN METER FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Van Meter High School Football team for winning the Iowa High School 1A State Football Championship.

I would like to congratulate each member of the team: Owen Jones, Alex Jones, Cody Coffman, Colby Wiederholt, Jack Trudo, Tyler Haynes, Carson Rhodes, Calvin Sieck, Anthony Potthoff, Blake Fryar, Blade Koons, Hunter Coyle, JJ Richards, Maddox Artzer, Kolby Booge, Zane Dodson, Gavin Goodrich, JJ Durlinger, Cade Costlow, Davis Coppinger, Jackson Wilcox, Cameron Smolik, Allen Van Pelt, Cole Lauterbach, Anthony Lowman, Zach Drummond, Kasey O'Brien, Quinn Corcoran, Antonio Angel, Sam Thompson, Ian Abrahamson, Kobe Richards, Isaac Roeder, Sam Bardwell, Parker Fryar, Owen Crawford, Sam Grob, Cole Crawford, Max Pettit, Brett Berg, Noah Hale, Collin Godwin, Connor Guess, Noah Miller, Sam Ruggles, Sam Miller, Carson Hess, Derek Golwitzer, Ryder Koons, Austin Emans, Jarin Young, Caleb Peterson, Grant Hulscher, Ryan Schmitt, Andrew Simpson Ryan Boles, Patrick Junker, Tyler Erdman, Sean Boles, Max Gilliland, Dakotah Herr, Gabe Kuehler, Zach Madden, Vincent Jacobs, Creighton Netten, Justin Hess, Chris Reames, Dusty Schultzen;

Head Coach: Eric Trudo;

Coaches: Rick Roberts, Dustin Wright, Joel Bartz, Jay Olson, Brian Gordon, Addison Boughton, and Curtis Giesking.

Mr. Speaker, by winning the championship this year, this team and their coaches demonstrated the rewards of hard work, commitment, and determination. I am honored to represent them in the United States Congress. I ask that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating the team for competing in this rigorous competition and in wishing them all nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY AND RICHARD GEISE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Nancy and Richard Geise of Underwood, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on November 17, 2017.

Nancy and Richard's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO MO COLLINS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mo Collins for being named Advocate of the Year by the Iowa Chapter of the National Association of Women Business Owners.

The Advocate of the Year is awarded to someone who has affected change through supporting and advocating for Iowa women business owners. Mo brings over 20 years of experience to her work, including 17 years in senior level roles launching and managing entrepreneurial and small business programs at the University of Northern Iowa. She is now a speaker, consultant, and writer whose focus on technology innovation, entrepreneurship, and small business issues has helped women all over North America to operate and run a business or organization in today's economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent Mo in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize her today for this outstanding accomplishment. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her and in wishing Mo nothing but continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LOUDOUN
COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the Loudoun County Chamber of Commerce, which celebrates its 50th anniversary in 2018. This year, at their annual gala, the Chamber, in addition to celebrating this auspicious anniversary, will honor 2017 Board Chair Tina Johnson of JP Events and Consulting, and welcome the new Board Chair Mitch Sproul of Toth Financial. I would also like to make special mention of Tony Howard, the CEO and President of the Loudoun Chamber, for his dedication and hard work throughout his tenure at the helm of the organization. I take this moment to recognize them as individuals as well as the entire Board of Directors and employees.

The Loudoun Chamber was incorporated in 1968. At this time, Loudoun County was primarily an agricultural economy, with more dairy farms than corporations in the region. Since, the Chamber has grown to be the largest Chamber of Commerce in northern Virginia with more than 1,200 members, including a booming service and manufacturing sector. Loudoun County is home to many companies in the Dulles Technology Corridor including Verizon Communications Inc., one of the largest multinational telecommunications companies in the world, as well as AOL and Orbital ATK Inc. Their work is vital in keeping America competitive in the 21st Century economy, and they greatly contribute to American technological discovery. Other major employers in the region include United Airlines and Raytheon Company. This region is also known as "DC's Wine Country" for the many vineyards in the area. The Loudoun Chamber has formed the premier network of business and community leaders in an economically vibrant region. In fact, Loudoun County is the fastest growing county in the country. Membership in the Loudoun Chamber is diverse and far-reaching, including businesses, nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, and public sector partners that range in size.

Loudoun County has been named by media publishers as one of the top communities to start and grow a business. In 2016 Money Magazine named Ashburn the best place to live in Virginia and one of the top 50 places to live in the United States. The Loudoun Chamber has been vital in fostering such a robust business environment that has helped the community achieve these accolades.

The Loudoun Chamber produces more than 100 programs a year that provide Loudoun businesses and their employees with valuable networking, marketing exposure, professional development, and opportunities to connect with peers and political and community leaders. These events have included the Annual Loudoun Small Business Awards, the Valor Awards to recognize public servants, and the SuperHero 5K Run/Walk.

Mr. Speaker, this is an organization which helps the citizens and businesses of Loudoun County thrive. I would ask my fellow Members to join me in congratulating the Loudoun County Chamber of Commerce and wishing it a happy 50th anniversary. I wish this institution continued success in the future.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH FENNEL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Joseph Fennell of Council Bluffs, Iowa on the very special occasion of his 100th birthday. Joseph was born on November 15, 1917.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Joseph's life. Since his birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Joseph has lived through eighteen United States Presidents and twenty-five Governors of Iowa. In his lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Joseph in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish him a very happy 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Joe on reaching this incredible milestone, and in wishing him even more health and happiness in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO VERONICA FENNEL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Veronica Fennell of Council Bluffs, Iowa on the very special occasion of her 100th birthday. Veronica was born on November 12, 1917.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Veronica's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Veronica has lived through eighteen United States Presidents and twenty-five Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Veronica in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Veronica on reaching this incredible milestone, and in wishing her even more health and happiness in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO JANE WHALEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jane

Whalen for receiving the Iowa Business Owner of the Year Award by the Iowa Chapter of the National Association of Women Business Owners.

The Woman Business Owner of the Year Award honors a woman business owner who has grown a business that has a positive impact on the economy and the community. Since 2002, Jane has led Midwest Project Partners, now Aureon Consulting, to become a well-known company that provides organization and management consulting with companies around the country. Her success has earned her the respect of many within the business community, and has translated to her participation on numerous boards and panels.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent Jane in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize her for this outstanding accomplishment. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Jane and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO BRYCE WILBUR

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Bryce Wilbur, of Indianola, Iowa, for attaining the rank of Eagle Scout.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to demonstrate how they live out the Scout Spirit in their life, to serve as a leader in their troop, earn a total of 21 merit badges, and, finally, to complete an Eagle Scout Project to benefit the community. For his project, Bryce supervised 25 people in tearing down an old stone retaining wall at Lake Ahquabi State Park in Indianola and replacing it with a new wall using railroad ties and crushed rock. The work ethic Bryce has shown in his Eagle Scout Project and throughout his scouting career speaks volumes about his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and bettering his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am proud to represent Bryce and his family in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him on obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF REVEREND DR. JAMES
HARGETT**HON. JIM COSTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. WATERS, to pay tribute and honor the life of Reverend Dr. James Hester Hargett. Reverend Dr. Hargett was a community and civil rights activist who dedicated his

life to helping others. He passed away on January 1, 2018 at the age of 87. His presence will be greatly missed by those who had the opportunity to know him.

James Hester Hargett was born on July 24, 1930 in Greensboro, North Carolina to Reverend F.A. and Mrs. Florence Hargett. Throughout his childhood and into high school, he forged a love for reading, music, and extra-curricular activities. Following his graduation from Dudley High School, he attended Johnson C. Smith University in Charlotte, North Carolina. He graduated with a Bachelor's degree in Political Science. While attending university, James met the love of his life Louilyn Funderburk and married her in 1954. In his senior year of college, he responded to the call of Christian service; the culmination of his childhood and influences from a professor in college.

Reverend Dr. Hargett would go on to earn a Masters of Divinity from Yale University Divinity School. Shortly after his graduation in 1955, he was named Associate Minister at the Church of Crossroads in Honolulu, Hawaii. After three years in Hawaii, James moved to Los Angeles in 1958 to join the Congregational Church of Christian Fellowship, United Church of Christ. The predominately African-American church focused on social justice in the community while also initiating change in vital areas. This included the development of a mental health clinic for low income earners, a student transportation program for overcrowded schools, and an enrichment program for minority students. James would march with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama in 1965. He also helped organize the Poor People's Resurrection City in Washington, D.C.

In 1969, James became the Secretary for Black Ministries, United Church of Christ Council for Church and Ministry in New York City. Through this role, he mentored young people and facilitated the creation of scholarships for seminary education. His journey would eventually take him to New Jersey, Chicago, and San Diego. No matter where he served, Reverend Dr. Hargett's ministry always focused on the recruitment of African Americans in Christian service in addition to community advocacy, education, human relations, mental health, and social justice.

Reverend Dr. Hargett retired after 42 years of service to the United Church of Christ in 1997. He was named Pastor Emeritus of the Christian Fellowship Congregational Church, UCC, San Diego. Following his retirement, he was awarded numerous honors, including being named a Living Legend by the United Black Christians and the Ministers for Racial, Social and Economic Justice of the United Church of Christ, General Assembly.

James leaves behind his beloved wife of 63 years Louilyn, daughters Meloni and Hester and son Darryl; sons-in-law Joseph and Eric; 5 grandchildren and numerous cherished family members and friends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join us on this day for a moment of silence in memory of the life and service of Reverend Dr. James Hester Hargett. His generous spirit and selfless way of living should serve as an example to us all. Reverend Dr. Hargett's memory will live on through the contributions he made to countless individuals. It is my honor to join his family and many friends in celebrating his life.

TRIBUTE TO NORMA JEAN AND BOB LINDEMAN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Norma Jean and Bob Lindeman of Atlantic, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 70th wedding anniversary. They were married on November 30, 1947 at the Lyman Gospel Hall in Lyman, Iowa.

Norma Jean and Bob's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 70th anniversary may their commitment grow even stronger as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 70th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO OTIS BARTHOLOMEW

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Otis Bartholomew of Tabor, Iowa on the very special occasion of his 100th birthday. Otis was born on November 26, 1917.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Otis' life. Since his birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Otis has lived through eighteen United States Presidents and twenty-five Governors of Iowa. In his lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Otis in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish him a very happy 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Otis on reaching this incredible milestone, and in wishing him even more health and happiness in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ROWENA CROSBIE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2018

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Rowena Crosbie for receiving the Hall of Fame Legacy Award by the National Association of Women Business Owners.

The Hall of Fame Legacy Award was established in 2014 to honor Iowa women business leaders whose leadership in business and

community has been an inspiration to others. Rowena founded Tero International, Inc., in 1993. Through her leadership, the training and development company has become well-known for their work in helping companies develop soft skills, such as business etiquette and negotiation and leadership skills, and boasts of graduates from over 40 countries around the world. Outside of Tero International, boards and organizations in the Des Moines and Central Iowa area have benefited from the time and talents Rowena has volunteered.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent leaders like Rowena in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize her today. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her for this outstanding accomplishment and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, January 30, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 6

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 2182, to provide for the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini, and S. 2325, to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 7

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining

To hold hearings to examine S. 414 and H.R. 1107, bills to promote conservation, improve public land management, and provide for sensible development in Pershing County, Nevada, S. 441, to designate the Organ Mountains and other public land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System in the State of New Mexico, S. 507, to sustain economic development and recreational use of National Forest

System land in the State of Montana, to add certain land to the National Wilderness Preservation System, to designate new areas for recreation, S. 612 and H.R. 1547, bills to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest to the City, S. 1046, to facilitate certain pinyon-juniper related projects in Lincoln County, Nevada, to modify the boundaries of certain wilderness areas in the State of Nevada, and to fully implement the White Pine County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act, S. 1219 and H.R. 3392, bills to provide for stability of title to certain land in the State of Louisiana, S. 1222, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to La Paz County, Arizona, S. 1481, to make technical corrections to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, S. 1665 and H.R. 2582, bills to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Resource Management Plan to be used for the

support and benefit of State institutions, S. 2062, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to convey at market value certain National Forest System land in the State of Arizona, S. 2206, to release certain wilderness study areas in the State of Montana, S. 2218, to provide for the conveyance of a Forest Service site in Dolores County, Colorado, to be used for a fire station, S. 2249, to permanently reauthorize the Rio Puerco Management Committee and the Rio Puerco Watershed Management Program, H.R. 995, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to modernize terms in certain regulations, and H.R. 1404, to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona.

SD-366

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland

To hold hearings to examine Army modernization.

SD-G50

FEBRUARY 8

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the opioid crisis, focusing on the impact on children and families.

SD-430

FEBRUARY 14

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support

To hold hearings to examine the current readiness of United States forces.

SR-222

FEBRUARY 15

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the state of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, focusing on pending rules, cryptocurrency regulation, and cross-border agreements.

SR-328A

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S527–S556

Measures Introduced: Five bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2349–2353, and S. Res. 384–385. **Page S549**

Measures Passed:

Joint Session of Congress: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 101, providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President. **Page S554**

Measures Considered:

Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2311, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children. **Pages S527–45**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 25), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S545**

ESCORT COMMITTEE—AGREEMENT: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 p.m., on Tuesday, January 30, 2018. **Page S554**

Washington's Farewell Address—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the resolution of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the traditional reading of Washington's Farewell Address take place on Monday, February 26, 2018, following the prayer and pledge; and that Senator Peters be recognized to deliver the address. **Page S554**

Stras Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of David Ryan Stras,

of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit. **Pages S546–48**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 57 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. 26), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S545**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at 2:15 p.m., on Tuesday, January 30, 2018. **Page S554**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Tuesday, January 30, 2018; and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and Leader remarks count post-cloture on the nomination. **Page S554**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

Gregory E. Maggs, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces for the term of fifteen years to expire on the date prescribed by law. **Pages S548, S556**

Messages from the House: **Page S549**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S549–50**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S550–53**

Additional Statements: **Pages S548–49**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S553**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—26) **Page S545**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:56 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, January 30, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S554.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 10 public bills, H.R. 4886–4895; and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 715–718 were introduced. **Pages H676–77**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H677–78**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2255, to clarify that nonprofit organizations may accept donated mortgage appraisals, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–528);

H.R. 4792, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for small businesses affected by hurricanes or other natural disasters, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–529);

H.R. 1426, to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act to allow Federal savings associations to elect to operate as national banks, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–530);

H.R. 4281, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–531);

H.R. 219, to correct the Swan Lake hydroelectric project survey boundary and to provide for the conveyance of the remaining tract of land within the corrected survey boundary to the State of Alaska (H. Rept. 115–532);

H.R. 2711, to designate a National Memorial to Fallen Educators at the National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia, Kansas, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–533);

H.R. 3058, to redesignate the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in the State of Missouri as the "Gateway Arch National Park" (H. Rept. 115–534);

H.R. 443, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the James K. Polk Home in Columbia, Tennessee, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–535);

H.R. 2630, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to La Paz County, Arizona, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–536); and

H. Res. 714, providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 695) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–537). **Page H676**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Johnson (LA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H631**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:05 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H632**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:08 p.m. and reconvened at 5 p.m. **Page H633**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act: S. 534, amended, to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nays vote of 406 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 45; **Pages H633–43, H652–53**

Making Online Banking Initiation Legal and Easy Act: H.R. 1457, amended, to establish requirements for use of a driver's license or personal identification card by certain financial institutions for opening an account or obtaining a financial product or service, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nays vote of 397 yeas to 8 nays, Roll No. 46; **Pages H644–45, H653–54**

Federal Savings Association Charter Flexibility Act: H.R. 1426, to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act to allow Federal savings associations to elect to operate as national banks; **Pages H645–47**

Housing Opportunities Made Easier Act: H.R. 2255, amended, to clarify that nonprofit organizations may accept donated mortgage appraisals; and **Pages H647–50**

Small Business Access to Capital After a Natural Disaster Act: H.R. 4792, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for small businesses affected by hurricanes or other natural disasters. **Pages H654–55**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Financial Institution Living Will Improvement Act: H.R. 4292, amended, to reform the living will process under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. **Pages H650–52**

Congressional Award Board—Appointment Withdrawal: The Chair announced the Speaker's withdrawal of the appointment of the following individual to the Congressional Award Board on January 25, 2018: Mr. Steve Hart of Washington, DC. **Page H657**

Senate Referral: S. 1873 was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. **Page H674**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate and message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H633 and H661.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H652–53 and H653. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:56 p.m.

Committee Meetings

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO THE CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on Senate amendments to H.R. 695, the “Child Protection Improvements Act of 2017” [Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2018]. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a rule providing for the consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 695. The rule makes in order a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title and concur in the Senate amendment to the text with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–56. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion and provides that it shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule provides that the Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule provides one hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Testimony was heard from Representatives Granger, Visclosky, and Polis.

BUSINESS MEETING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a business meeting to consider pending Committee business and other matters. A vote to call to the attention of the entire House, classified executive session material passed; amendments were considered and voted on; and a vote to publicly disclose the material contained in a classified executive session memo, as made available to the entire House of Representatives on January 18, 2018, passed. This meeting was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the situation on the Korean Peninsula and United States strategy in the Indo-Pacific region, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the Financial Stability Oversight Council Annual Report to Congress, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine opportunities to support domestic seafood through aquaculture, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act one year later, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider subcommittee assignments for the Second Session of the 115th Congress, and the nominations of Melissa F. Burnison, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs), Susan Combs, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Ryan Douglas Nelson, of Idaho, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and Anne Marie White, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management); to be immediately followed an oversight hearing to examine the role of the Geological Survey and the Forest Service in preparing for and responding to natural hazard events, as well as the current status of mapping and monitoring systems, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold an oversight hearing to examine testimony from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the economic relationship between the United States, Canada, and Mexico, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on accountability and risk to taxpayers, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security, to hold hearings to examine small business health plans, 3:30 p.m., SD–430.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Readying the U.S. Military for Future Warfare”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled “CBO Oversight: Organizational and Operational Structure”, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, hearing on “Protecting Privacy, Promoting Policy: Evidence-Based Policymaking and the Future of Education”, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Examining Implementation of the Compounding Quality Act”, 11 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled “Closing the Digital Divide: Broadband Infrastructure Solutions”, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy, markup on H.R. 3477, the “Ceiling Fan Energy Conservation Harmonization Act”, 1 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled “Examining Opportunities and Challenges in the Financial Technology (“Fintech”) Marketplace”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Following the Money: How Human Traffickers Exploit U.S. Financial Markets”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security; and Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, joint hearing entitled “Securing Our Surface Transportation Systems: Examining the Department of Homeland Security’s Role in Surface Transportation Technologies”, 2 p.m., HVC–210.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3808, the “Infrastructure Expansion Act of 2017”, 11:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing on H.R. 4532, the “Shash Jáa National Monument and Indian Creek National Monument Act”, 10:30 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Department of Energy: Management and Priorities”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Small Business Information Sharing: Combating Foreign Cyber Threats”, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing entitled “Examination of Reports on the El Faro Marine Casualty and Coast Guard’s Electronic Health Records”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Appeals Reform: Will VA’s Implementation Effectively Serve Veterans?”, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing entitled “Member Day Hearing on Legislation to Improve Tax Administration”, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of January 30 through February 2, 2018

Senate Chamber

On *Tuesday*, Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 2:15 p.m.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: January 30, to hold hearings to examine the situation on the Korean Peninsula and United States strategy in the Indo-Pacific region, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: January 30, to hold hearings to examine the Financial Stability Oversight Council Annual Report to Congress, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: January 30, to hold hearings to examine opportunities to support domestic seafood through aquaculture, 10 a.m., SR–253.

January 30, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act one year later, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: January 30, business meeting to consider subcommittee assignments for the Second Session of the 115th Congress, and the nominations of Melissa F. Burnison, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs), Susan Combs, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Ryan Douglas Nelson, of Idaho, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and Anne Marie White, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management); to be immediately followed an oversight hearing to examine the role of the Geological Survey and the Forest Service in preparing for and responding to natural hazard events, as well as the current status of mapping and monitoring systems, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: January 30, to hold an oversight hearing to examine testimony from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: January 30, to hold hearings to examine the economic relationship between the United States, Canada, and Mexico, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: January 30, to hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on accountability and risk to taxpayers, 10 a.m., SD–430.

January 30, Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security, to hold hearings to examine small business health plans, 3:30 p.m., SD–430.

Select Committee on Intelligence: January 30, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House Committees

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, January 30

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 2:15 p.m.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

(Senators will gather in the Senate Chamber at 8:20 p.m. and proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives at 8:25 p.m., to receive a State of the Union Address from the President.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, January 30

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of the Senate Amendments to H.R. 695—Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2018 (Subject to a Rule). Joint Session with the Senate to receive the State of the Union Address from the President of the United States.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Banks, Jim, Ind., E107
Comstock, Barbara, Va., E109
Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E105
Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E101
Costa, Jim, Calif., E109
Handel, Karen C., Ga., E103
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E103
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E104

Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E103, E107
McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E102, E104, E107
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E106
Olson, Pete, Tex., E101, E103, E104, E105, E105, E106, E108
Poe, Ted, Tex., E101, E108
Rice, Kathleen M., N.Y., E101
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E101, E104, E106
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E103, E107
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E104

Shuster, Bill, Pa., E102
Smith, Lamar, Tex., E103
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E105
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E106
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E102
Westerman, Bruce, Ark., E106
Young, David, Iowa, E108, E108, E108, E109, E109, E109, E109, E110, E110, E110, E110



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are